REPORT RESUMES

ED 018 209 JC 680 092
EXPERIENCES AND ATTITUDES OF AMERICAN ADULTS CONCERNING
STANDARDIZED INTELLIGENCE TESTS.
BY- BRIM, ORVILLE G., JR. AND OTHERS
RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.
REPORT NUMBER RSF-TR-1 PUB DATE 65
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$7.88 195P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ADULTS, *ATTITUDES, *EXPERIENCE, *INTELLIGENCE
TESTS, *APTITUDE TESTS, FIELD INTERVIEWS, RUSSELL SAGE
FOUNDATION,

AS A PHASE OF A STUDY OF THE SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF ABILITY TESTING, A NATIONAL STRATIFIED RANDOM SAMPLE OF 1,482 ADULTS WAS INTERVIEWED. OF THE RESPONDENTS, 59 PERCENT REPORTED AT LEAST ONE EXPERIENCE WITH A TEST OF APTITUDE OR INTELLIGENCE. WHILE THEY SAID THEY WERE RELATIVELY WELL INFORMED ABOUT TEST RESULTS THEY CONSIDERED SUCH TESTS AS LESS IMPORTANT THAN SCHOOL OR WORK SUCCESS AS INDICATIONS OF ABILITY. TEST EXPERIENCES WERE MORE COMMON AMONG MALES, AMONG YOUNGER RESPONDENTS, AND AMONG WHITE PERSONS. MEMBERS OF LOWER CLASSES ARE LESS LIKELY TO HAVE TAKEN TESTS AND THEIR EXPERIENCE IS IN FEWER CONTEXTS. THOSE WHO HAVE A FAVORABLE ATTITUDE TOWARD SUCH TESTS TEND TO BE BETTER INFORMED ABOUT TESTS AND ABOUT THEIR OWN SCORES. INTELLIGENCE TESTS ARE SEEN AS MEASURING WHAT IS INBORN, RATHER THAN WHAT IS LEARNED, MORE FREQUENTLY BY WOMEN, BY NEGROES, AND BY LOWER CLASS MEMBERS. THE BULK OF THE REPORT CONSISTS OF TABLES SHOWING DISTRIBUTIONS OF RESPONSES. (WO)

ERIC

ED018209

EXPERIENCES AND ATTITUDES OF AMERICAN ADULTS CONCERNING STANDARDIZED INTELLIGENCE TESTS

Orville G. Brim, Jr.
John Neulinger
David C. Glass

Technical Report No. 1 on the Social Consequences of Testing

Published by Russell Sage Foundation

TC 680 092

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EXPERIENCES AND ATTITUDES OF AMERICAN ADULTS CONCERNING STANDARDIZED INTELLIGENCE TESTS

Orville G. Brim, Jr.
John Neulinger
David C. Glass

Technical Report No. 1 on the Social Consequences of Testing

Russell Sage Foundation

New York 1965

JC 680 092

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 23 1968

CLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Eleanor Dessley for
Russell Sage Foundation
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

© 1965
Russell Sage Foundation

Library of Congress
Catalog Card Number: 65-26816

PREFACE

In June 1962 Russell Sage Foundation initiated a series of studies of the social consequences of standardized intelligence, aptitude and achievement testing in the United States. The general purpose of the research program is to develop a broad sociological perspective on the current use of ability tests and on their consequences for individuals and for social organizations. The series of studies, which is under the direction of Orville G. Brim, Jr., David A. Goslin, and David C. Glass, is being supported jointly by Carnegie Corporation of New York and Russell Sage Foundation, and the United States Office of Education. Its primary focus is on the social impact of tests of intellectual abilities rather than tests of other aspects of personality such as motivations, interests, or values.

This is the first in a series of technical reports, which will present basic frequency tabulations of experiences and attitudes concerning tests, and in some instances cross-tabulations of selected variables. No attempts are made in these technical reports to analyze the data in depth or to focus on particular topics. Rather, these reports are designed to serve as data repositories. They present an intermediate step toward complete analysis. Subsequent books or articles will focus on selected policy questions or points of interest.

This first technical report presents basic frequency tabulations of data resulting from an interview survey, cross-tabulations between interview items, and interpretative comments and explanations. The interviews were conducted in the spring of 1963 on a national sample of American adults, through the facilities of the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, as part of one of the Center's "amalgam" surveys.

Preparation of the questionnaire, analysis of the data and the final report of the study are the responsibility of Russell Sage Foundation.

The research on which this technical report is based is focused on the American adult. The data, however, should be seen in the context of the program of related studies being carried on by Russell Sage Foundation of which this is a particular component. The other major units of the Russell Sage Foundation program are summarized below.

At the elementary school level, fifteen fifth grade boys and girls from each of 16 different elementary schools have been interviewed concerning their perceptions of tests, their own intellectual abilities, and intelligence in general. The sample of schools was selected on the basis of results from a survey of testing programs in 714 elementary schools in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.* The schools differ on three independent variables: extent of standardized testing, homogeneous grouping, and reporting of scores to parents. Additional questionnaire data, along with test scores and sociometric information, are being collected from parents, teachers, principals, and the remaining fifth graders in each school.

At the secondary school level,** questionnaire data were collected from 5,321 respondents, 10th or 12th graders, in 40 public secondary schools (general high schools, not technical schools) selected by quota sampling methods in accord with procedures used by Project Talent designed to be representative of varying regions, urban and rural characteristics, and income level. Ten parochial schools (2,636 respondents) and nine private schools (1,198 respondents) also were included. In both the latter cases the sample was "purposive" rather than statistically random, the agencies with complete lists of these two types of schools being asked to submit names to those believed to adequately represent the two classes of schools. The private schools are primarily in the east and are among those generally considered to be leading preparatory institutions. Five schools had an all-male student body, and four schools had female students. In addition data were obtained from teachers and counselors in all schools regarding their attitudes toward and uses of standardized tests of ability.

---

*Goslin, David A., Rayner, Roberta E., & Hallock, Barbara. The Use of Standardized Tests in Elementary Schools, Technical Report #2 on the Social Consequences of Testing, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1965.

**Brim, Orville G. Jr., Goslin, David A., Glass, David C., & Goldberg, Isadore. The Use of Standardized Ability Tests in American Secondary Schools and Their Impact on Students, Teachers, and Administrators, Technical Report #3 on the Social Consequences of Testing, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1965.

A closely related study deals with data collected from approximately 100 counselors from the Boston metropolitan area conducted by David Armor of the Department of Social Relations at Harvard University. Data on the counselor's role and his use of tests have been gathered through direct interviews, and additional data are being collected through the use of a short mail questionnaire to a larger sample of schools. Specific foci of this study include the views of the counselor concerning the importance of ability testing in counseling, on whether he thinks they are reliable predictors of performance in certain vocations and of success in colleges, and on whether he considers grades or achievement or perhaps even teacher evaluation as better predictors than aptitude or I.Q. test scores. Such views will be evaluated against the background of his own social origins and professional training.

Thus far primary emphasis has been on effects of educational testing. However, tests are also used to a significant extent in business and industrial organizations and research on this aspect of test use forms part of the overall program. Under the direction of Dr. Vernon E. Buck of the Yale Labor and Management Center, this study will be part of a larger research program on the effects of technological change in industry. The general work is under the auspices of the Yale Technology Project, directed by Dr. Stanley F. Udy, Jr., of the Department of Sociology. The research will make use of existing data collected by the Technology Project and will involve the collection of new data in the field from a number of participating major corporations.

In its overall scope this series of studies provides the opportunity for comparisons of attitudes and beliefs about tests, and about their impact on individuals and institutional activities (1) at different levels within the same institution, for example, the elementary and secondary school levels in education; (2) from one institutional context to another, for example, between education on the one hand and business and industry on the other; (3) at different age levels in the population as a whole, for example, the national sample of American adults can be contrasted with teenagers and nine and ten-year olds in terms of differential experience with tests, their perceived impact, and their values or attitudes related to such tests. The studies should provide a broad picture of testing in American society.

A number of people have contributed valuable assistance in the preparation of this report. Those at Russell Sage Foundation included Renée Bash, Kathleen Grenham, Antoine H. Gal, Neville Gerson, Susan Kim, Laurel Leonard, Arthur Meinzer, Mark Oromaner, Suzanne M. Spencer, and David Werdegar.

The advisory committee to the Russell Sage Foundation studies gave valued assistance in the conception and planning of this study. The committee members are: Bernard Berelson, John H. Fischer, Wayne H. Holtzman, Horace Miner, Wilbert E. Moore, Talcott Parsons, Henry W. Riecken, and

Ralph W. Tyler.

Finally, we acknowledge with gratitude the financial support of Carnegie Corporation of New York and of Russell Sage Foundation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface iii

List of Tables x

Chapter I. Introduction 1

Chapter II. Procedure 9

Chapter III. The Questionnaire 15

Chapter IV. Results: Marginals 27

Chapter V. Results: Social Structural and Social Class Differences 45

Chapter VI. Results: Attitudes and Values 71

Chapter VII. Summary of Results 85

Appendices

Appendix A. The Questionnaire 91

Appendix B. Tables 107

Appendix C. Findings Relating to Religious Differences 191

LIST OF TABLES

Table Number	Title	Page
1.	A Classification of Respondents by Social Class Indices: Education, Occupational Prestige and Index of Social Position	109
2.	A Classification of Respondents by Total Family Income	110
3.	Frequency and percentage distribution of responses on "total test taking experience" index	111
4.	Frequencies and percentages of "yes" responses to the question "Have you ever taken any tests of your aptitudes, or IQ, or intelligence, in ..."	112
5.	Frequency and percentage distribution of responses indicating which test situations were most important	113
6.	Frequency and percentage distribution of the descriptions of tests taken	114
7.	Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "Have any of your children ever taken an intelligence, IQ or aptitude test, for example, in school, in military service, or at work?"	115
8.	Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "Think for a moment of the intelligence, IQ or aptitude test(s) you haven taken. How clear or definite an idea did you get about your intelligence from the test(s) you took?"	116
9.	Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "Did you ever receive any information about how well your children did on any of the intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests they took?"	117
10.	Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "How do you think you compare to other people in intelligence? I am going to name some people and ask you how you compare to them. Beginning with your father, would you say that you are much higher in intelligence, higher, about the same, lower, or much lower?"	118
11.	Frequency and percentage distributions of "intelligence comparison" indices	119
12.	Frequency and percentage distributions of "intelligence comparison" indices (family items)	120
13.	Frequency and percentage distributions of "intelligence comparison" indices (non-family items)	120

Table Number	Title	Page
14.	Frequency and percentage distributions of "intelligence comparison" indices (family of orientation only)	121
15.	Frequency and percentage distributions of "intelligence comparison" indices (family of procreation only)	121
16A.	Frequency and percentage distribution of responses indicating most important source of own intelligence estimate	122
16B.	Frequency and percentage distribution of responses indicating next most important source of own intelligence estimate	123
16C.	Frequency and percentage distribution of responses indicating third most important source of own intelligence estimate	124
17.	Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "Now think of all the intelligence, IQ, or aptitude tests you have taken. Do you think any of these things happened to you partly as a result of taking these tests?"	125
18.	Frequency and percentage distribution of "perceived total influence" index	126
19.	Frequency and percentage distribution of "perceived positive influence" index	127
20.	Frequency and percentage distribution of "perceived negative influence" index	127
21.	Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "Do you think intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests measure the intelligence a person is born with, or what he has learned?"	128
22.	Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "In general, which of the following best expresses your opinion about the accuracy of intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests?"	128
23.	Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "Do you think the kind of intelligence measured by intelligence, IQ and aptitude tests matters much in life?"	129
24.	Frequency and percentage distributions of responses to the question "Given tests as they are now, do you think it is fair to use intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests to help make the following decisions?"	130
25.	Frequency and percentage distributions of responses to questions relating to social values	131

Table Number	Title	Page
26.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests, by social structural variables	133
27.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests, by social class indices	134
28A.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experiences with standardized tests in a school testing situation, by social structural variables	135
28B.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests in an occupational testing situation, by social structural variables	136
28C.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests in other types of testing situations, by social structural variables	137
29A.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests in a school testing situation, by social class indices	138
29B.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests in an occupational testing situation, by social class indices	139
29C.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests in other types of testing situation, by social class indices	140
30.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who report that their children have taken standardized tests, by social structural variables	141
31.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who report that their children have taken standardized tests, by social class indices	142
32.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who arranged to have their child tested, by social structural variables	143
33.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who arranged to have their child tested, by social class indices	144
34.	Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question "How clear or definite an idea did you get about your intelligence, from the test(s) you took?" by social structural variables	145

Table Number	Title	Page
35.	Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question "How clear or definite an idea did you get about your intelligence, from the test(s) you took?" by social class indices	146
36.	Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question "Did you ever receive any information about how well your children did on any of the intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests they took?" by social structural variables	147
37.	Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question "Did you ever receive any information about how well your children did on any of the intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests they took?" by social class indices	148
38.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think they are "higher than others" or "lower than others" in intelligence, by social structural variables	149
39.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think they are "higher than others" or "lower than others" in intelligence, by social class indices	150
40.	Frequencies and percentages of responses indicating most important sources used for estimating own intelligence: performance criteria, by social structural variables	151
41.	Frequencies and percentages of responses indicating most important sources used for estimating own intelligence: performance criteria, by social class indices	153
42.	Frequency and percentage distribution of "perceived total influence" index, by social structural variables	155
43.	Frequency and percentage distribution of "perceived total influence" index, by social class indices	156
44.	Frequencies and percentages of responses indicating most important sources used for estimating own intelligence: performance criteria, by "perceived total influence" index	157
45.	Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question about the nature of tested intelligence, by social structural variables	158
46.	Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question about the nature of tested intelligence, by social class indices	159
47.	Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question about perceived accuracy of tests, by social structural variables	160

Table Number	Title	Page
48.	Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question about perceived accuracy of tests, by social class indices	161
49.	Frequencies and percentages of responses to question about the importance of tested intelligence in life, by social structural variables	162
50.	Frequencies and percentages of responses to question about the importance of tested intelligence in life, by social class indices	163
51A.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for educational decisions, by social structural variables	164
51B.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for occupational decisions and decisions about voting and marrying, by social structural variables	165
52A.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for educational decisions, by social class indices	166
52B.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for occupational decisions and decisions about voting and marrying, by social class indices	167
53.	Frequency and percentage distributions on Generational Social Mobility indices	168
54.	Frequency and percentage distributions on Social Mobility through Marriage indices	169
55A.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents at each level of social class (Education), by social mobility (Generational)	170
55B.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents at each level of social class (Occupational Prestige), by social mobility (Generational)	170
55C.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents at each level of social class (Index of Social Position), by social mobility (Generational)	171
56A.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents at each level of social class (Education), by social mobility (Mobility Through Marriage)	172

Table Number	Title	Page
56B.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents at each level of social class (Occupational Prestige), by social mobility (Mobility Through Marriage)	172
56C.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents at each level of social class (Index of Social Position), by social mobility (Mobility Through Marriage)	173
57.	Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question "How clear or definite an idea did you get about your intelligence, from the test(s) you took?" by attitude variables: accuracy of tests, nature of tested intelligence, and importance of tested intelligence in life	174
58.	Frequency and percentage distributions of "perceived total influence" index, by attitude variables: accuracy of tests, nature of tested intelligence, and importance of tested intelligence in life	175
59A.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for educational decisions, by attitude variables: accuracy of tests, nature of tested intelligence, and importance of tested intelligence in life	176
59B.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for occupational decisions and decisions about voting and marrying, by attitude variables: accuracy of tests, nature of tested intelligence, and importance of tested intelligence in life	177
60.	Frequency and percentage distribution of "perceived total influence" index, by attitude variable: fairness of the use of tests	178
61A.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for educational decisions, by most important sources used for estimating own intelligence	179
61B.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for occupational decisions and decisions about voting and marrying, by most important sources used for estimating own intelligence	180
62A.	Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question about the nature of tested intelligence, by social values	181
62B.	Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question about the nature of tested intelligence, by social values	182

Table Number	Title	Page
62C.	Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question about the nature of tested intelligence, by social values	183
63A.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for educational decisions, by social values	184
63B.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for occupational decisions and decisions about voting and marrying, by social values	185
64A.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for educational decisions, by social values	186
64B.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for occupational decisions and decisions about voting and marrying, by social values	187
65A.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for educational decisions, by social values	188
65B.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for occupational decisions and decisions about voting and marrying, by social values	189
66.	Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests, by rural-urban residence and by religion	190

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This report presents data on the experiences and attitudes of American adults regarding standardized intelligence tests. It presents the frequencies of responses to questionnaire items, a number of cross-tabulations between items, and some interpretive comment and explanation.

The objectives of the study can be summarized as follows:

1. To determine the extent of experience of American adults with standardized intelligence testing;
2. To determine what Americans think about intelligence and intelligence tests;
3. To determine what Americans think about intelligence testing, i.e., do they see themselves as affected by tests and do they approve of the use of tests;
4. To investigate the relationship between a person's experience with tests and his beliefs and opinions about tests;
5. To investigate the relationship of a person's orientation toward society at large and his beliefs about tests and testing.

These objectives are dictated by our larger goal of investigating the social consequences of ability testing. Testing has become a national issue. It has been estimated that the number of standardized tests being given annually in the United States exceeds one hundred and fifty million.* Concomitant with the rise of the testing movement has been an increasing hostility toward standardized tests. This hostility has found powerful spokesmen and has led to congressional investigations and suggested "corrective" legislation. It has been argued that standardized tests are unfair to the creative child* and that tests are unfair to the culturally deprived because the content of tests is often highly verbal and culture-bound.** Some have maintained that ability grouping based on a child's test scores may freeze the teachers' expectations as well as the child's self-image, to the detriment of the child's intellectual development. One is tempted to suggest that the clearest social consequence of testing is a vigorous anti-testing attitude.

---

*Goslin, David A., The Search for Ability, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1963.

What are the reasons for this rejection of tests? Brim*** has discussed five issues underlying the anti-testing attitude: (1) inaccessibility of test data, (2) invasion of privacy, (3) rigidity in use of test scores, (4) restriction in the kind of talent selected by tests and neglect of qualities other than intelligence, and (5) fairness of using tests with minority groups. These factors determine, in large part, the current attitudes toward standardized tests. However, there are other types of opposition, such as those arising from the personal and social characteristics of the critics themselves. For example, personality characteristics may lead an individual to perceive tests as threatening. Or, the feeling of the disagreeable experience of having received an unexpectedly low test score may generalize to a dislike of tests.

---

*Hoffman, Banesh, The Tyranny of Testing. New York: Crowell-Collier, 1962.

**Black, Hillel, They Shall Not Pass. New York: Morrow, 1963.

***Brim, Orville G. Jr., "American Attitudes Toward Intelligence Tests". American Psychologist, 1965, 20, 125-130.

It is clear that efforts at creating a more favorable climate for standardized testing will have to deal not only with the arguments raised against tests, but with the motivational factors which lead people to engage in these arguments. The importance of considering both sets of factors has been forcefully enunciated by Gardner: "As the tests improve and become less vulnerable to present criticism, the hostility to them may actually increase. A proverbial phrase indicating complete rejection is, 'I wouldn't like it even if it were good.' With the tests, the more appropriate phrase might be, 'I wouldn't like them especially if they were good'."*

Whatever may be the specific sources of resistance to standardized testing, the fact remains that we know very little about the effects of testing on both the individual and his society. The compilation of descriptive data relevant to this problem is an indispensable basis for any set of recommendations regarding future use of standardized tests. How, for example, do tests and test scores actually effect the self-concept of the person who takes tests? To what extent have people taken ability tests, and what kinds of attitudes do they hold toward such tests? The purpose of this study is to answer these and related questions, on the assumption that this information will provide a basis for policy recommendations.

The National Opinion Research Center conducted for Russell Sage Foundation 1482 interviews with a national sample of American adults. Sampling procedures and characteristics of the sample are described in Chapter II of this report. The questions asked and the reasons for asking them are discussed in detail in Chapter III. Here we mention only briefly the areas covered in the survey. First, we assessed the amount of a respondent's test taking experience as well as the contexts in which he took the tests. The test experiences of the respondent's children also were of interest, as was the amount of feedback respondents received about their test performance, and how they felt they compared with others in intelligence. We also inquired about various attitudes toward tests. Included were questions dealing with the accuracy of tests, the nature of tested intelligence, the fairness of using tests, and so forth. The impact of ability testing on an individual is directly related to his perception of the test. A score on an intelligence test will have very different consequences for the individual who believes that the score represents his "true ability" than for the individual who has little faith in the accuracy of the score. The attitudes of an individual toward tests may also affect the test performance itself. Thus, if he feels that what intelligence tests measure is not very important in life, he is not likely to be motivated to do well on such tests.

---

*Gardner, John W., Excellence, Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too? New York: Harper, 1961, pp. 47-48.

A person's test taking experience and his attitudes toward tests are not isolated parts of his total experience. Tests are involved in some of man's most vital decisions. They influence his position in society and thus work to shape the nature of society itself. We decided, therefore, to investigate the relationship between a person's general orientation toward society and his feelings about tests and testing. The dimensions chosen for investigation were those stated by Gardner* in his discussion of the decline of hereditary privilege. Gardner sees two viewpoints competing with the traditional orientation of hereditary privilege: equalitarianism and intellectual elitism. Both of these orientations have their place in modern American society and their coexistence often leads to conflicts between people (and within a single personality). These viewpoints are bound to lead to different attitudes toward tests. In an aristocratic society one's social position is more or less fixed, and testing, representing a challenge to this order, would not be condoned. The equalitarian viewpoint comes into conflict with testing to the degree that tests detect individual differences which are then emphasized for further development. Intellectual elitists, in contrast, should welcome testing as a useful tool for discovering the talented few who are to rise to the top. We have discussed these issues in more detail in Chapter VI.

---

*Gardner, John W., Excellence, Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too? New York: Harper, 1961.

Chapters IV through VI report the response frequencies to all questions, including such indices as a "total test taking experience" and a "total perceived influence" index. The frequencies are analyzed by sex, age, race, religion and political preference. Social class effects are measured in terms of three indices: (1) respondent's education, (2) respondent's occupational prestige, and (3) an index of social position.*

In a final chapter, we summarize all findings. As we pointed out before, our analyses were not intended to go into depth and our discussions will therefore be on a preliminary level. In later reports, attempts will be made to interrelate the findings through more thorough analyses of the data and to advance from mere reporting to an interpretation of the results.

---

* Hollingshead, August B. & Redlich, Frederick C., Social Class and Mental Illness. New York: Wiley, 1958.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE

Selecting the Sample

In this study the objective was to have a sample representative of the total non-institutionalized population of the United States, 21 years of age or older. The sampling procedure used was designed by the National Opinion Research Center, which directed all phases of the field operation. The sample was a standard multi-stage area probability sample to the block level. Probabilities of selection were made proportionate to the estimated 1953 population, updated to include the 1960 census and extrapolated to the expected 1967 population. At the block level, quota sampling procedures were employed, quotas being based on sex, age, race and employment status (i.e., whether potential respondents were employed or unemployed).

Characteristics of the Sample

The sample consisted of 1482 respondents, 48% males and 52% females. The age distribution of the respondents was as follows: 0.3% were under 20, 23% were between the ages of 21 and 30, 26% between 31 and 40, 19% between 41 and 50, and 17% were over 61. Eighty-six per cent of the respondents were white and 13% were Negro. The predominant religious preference was Protestant (72%), with Catholic (24%) second, and Jewish (2%) third. Fifty-three per cent considered themselves Democrats, 28% Republicans and 16% independent voters.

Eighty-three per cent of the males were currently married; 10% were single or never married, 4% separated or divorced, and 4% widowed. Of the females, 77% were married; 4% single, never married; 8% separated or divorced and 10% widowed. Of all the ever married respondents 87% had children, the greatest number (24%) having two.

On the basis of information gathered in the questionnaire the sample may also be described in terms of social class variables. Respondents were asked to state the kind of work they do and the last grade they completed in school. They were asked to do the same for their father, their father-in-law and, in the case of married women, for their husband.

Ten per cent of the respondents reported at least some grade school;* 22% reported having attended junior high school and 15% some high school (Table 1).** Twenty-nine per cent said that they graduated from high school; 14% reported some college education. Six per cent listed themselves as college graduates and 4% as having some graduate training.

A classification of respondents by occupational prestige resulted in the following distribution: 3% were members of the highest group, i.e., higher executives, large proprietors and major professionals. Nine per cent fell into the next category consisting of business managers, proprietors of medium businesses, and lesser professionals. The third category, accounting for 9% of the respondents, includes administrative personnel, small independent businessmen, minor professionals, and farmers. Twenty-eight per cent, the modal category, consists of clerical and sales workers, technicians, owners of little businesses, and farmers. Fourteen per cent are skilled manual employees or small farmers, 21% are machine operators, semi-skilled employees or small tenant farmers. Finally, 16% of the respondents are classified as unskilled employees or sharecroppers.

---

*The Educational and Occupational Prestige Indices are presented in their original form as well as in a condensed version. Categories were collapsed to achieve comparability to the Index of Social Position (ISP), and the three indices were used in this manner for purposes of subsequent cross-tabulations.

**All tables discussed in this report are presented in Appendix B.

Respondents were further classified in terms of the Hollingshead Index of Social Position,* yielding the following distribution: 2% in Class I (highest class), 11% in Class II, 29% in Class III, 32% in Class IV, and 25% in Class V (lowest class).

Information about the income distribution of the sample is available from a question which inquired about the total family income in 1962. (Table 2). According to responses to this question, 12% of the respondents earned less than $2,000.00 per year. Twenty-one per cent reported an income of $2,000.00 to $3,999.00, and 53% of the respondents are fairly evenly divided over the $4,000.00 to $10,000.00 range. Thirteen per cent of the respondents report earning more than $10,000.00.

The working patterns of respondents showed the following distribution: 46% reported working full-time, 9% part-time. Seven per cent stated that they were retired, and 4% that they were unemployed. Thirty per cent of the respondents said that they were housewives.

The characteristics of our sample accord, by and large, with those reported by the 1960 census. The age and sex distribution match the census figures very closely. For race, our sample overrepresents Negro respondents by about 4%, probably because of oversampling of urban areas. Although proportions of the different religious groups were not directly available from the census, estimates based on the work of Bogue** indicate our sample figures agree fairly closely with the 1950 census. The sample, however, was unduly weighted in favor of those currently married (an excess of 9% males and 11% females), with correspondingly fewer single and widowed respondents. The reason for this may be the greater likelihood that the married will be at home and available for an interview or a higher refusal rate. The percentage of divorced cases was much the same as that reported by the 1960 census. The median years of education of our respondents was about one-and-a-half years higher than the census figures: Compared to the national population, 12% more respondents had 12 or more years of education. Such a higher frequency of non-respondents at the lower class levels may again reflect either the smaller likelihood of the lower class respondents of being at home when the interviewer arrives, or a higher refusal rate. Our sample also underrepresents the very lowest income groups and overrepresents people earning $7,000.00 or more per year.

---

*Hollingshead, August B. & Redlich, Frederick C., Social Class and Mental Illness. New York: Wiley, 1958

**Bogue, Donald J., The Population of the United States. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1959.

In summary it may be said that the sample of respondents was selected to be representative of the United States population, with the exception of institutionalized persons and those under 21 years of age. This goal was achieved with the exceptions as noted.

Data Collection

All respondents were interviewed individually in their homes by the field staff of the National Opinion Research Center. The questions asked for our study were part of an "amalgamated" interview, i.e., three other studies not related to ours were partners in the total interview. Questions pertaining to our study were asked in the first part of the interview and are therefore not likely to have been affected by this procedure. Our part of the questionnaire (see Appendix A) consisted of 32 pre-coded items and an additional four open-ended questions designed to determine the types of tests the respondent had taken during his lifetime. The average length of the total interview was one and a half hours, our part taking about 30 minutes.

CHAPTER III

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

CHAPTER III

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

In this section we shall examine the various questions asked, discuss the reasons for their inclusion in the interview, and consider some of the possible results. Let us restate that we are concerned with two distinct aspects of intelligence testing. One is the amount of contact people have had with testing. How many people have taken tests, how many have not? Where have they taken them and when? The second aspect of testing with which we are concerned deals with opinions, attitudes and beliefs people hold about intelligence tests and testing. Questions here are focused on such things as perceptions about intelligence and the influence of testing on a person's chances for success in life.

Somewhat apart from these two concerns, but closely related to them, are questions about the person's beliefs about how society should be organized. An analysis of individual differences in such beliefs may contribute to an understanding of the formation of attitudes toward tests.

In accord with the above, we have grouped the items from the questionnaire under the following headings: (1) experience with intelligence tests, (2) perceptions of intelligence and intelligence testing, (3) opinions about and attitudes toward intelligence tests and testing, and (4) value orientations of respondents.

Experience with intelligence tests.

Clearly the most critical dimension in the assessment of a person's experience with tests is one of experience versus no-experience. Knowing about tests by having taken them is quite different from knowing about tests through hearsay or reading. Similarly, perceiving to have been affected by test results is different from knowing that one can be affected by them. Thus, the first task is to draw the dividing line between those respondents who report having been tested and those who say that they have never taken a test. To accomplish this and to establish at the same time the context in which tests were taken the following question was asked:

12. "Have you ever taken any tests of your aptitudes, or IQ, or intelligence, in ..."

A list of nine situations ranging from "In elementary (grade) school?" to "In a private testing service or with a psychologist?" accompanied this question, the respondent being given a choice of three response categories: "Yes," "No," or "Don't know or don't remember."* Answers to this item were analyzed in two ways. First, we examined what might be considered the quantitative aspects of test experience. We constructed an index of test taking experience by summing for each respondent the "Yes" responses to all nine situations. A zero score on such an index means no test taking experience. A score other than zero means some reported test taking experience in one or more different situations, the number depending on the number of "Yes" responses. For example, a score of 3 would mean that the respondent reports having taken tests in three different situations. It does not mean that the respondent reports having taken three tests or that he has three times as much test experience as a respondent with a score of 1.** This index, then, is taken as a measure of the degree to which tests impinge on the person from all sides.

---

* See Appendix A, for a listing of all items including response categories.

** When referring to this index we shall speak of a score of 1 as "a respondent having taken one test," a score of 2 as "a respondent having taken two tests," etc., but this is only for purposes of ease of exposition.

Second, we analyzed answers to this question in terms of their qualitative aspects. We determined which areas or situations were most likely to be the occasion for tests and, for respondents who had taken tests in more than one area, which they perceived as most important. As recently pointed out by Fiske*, the perceived importance or consequence of a test may be more influential in shaping a respondent's attitude toward the test than the nature of the test itself. We also asked the respondents to indicate what the test or tests they had taken were like. Answers to this question were categorized as follows: (1) "intelligence, IQ or aptitude," (2) special aptitude, (3) achievement-school, (4) achievement-nonscholastic, (5) emotional, motivational, personality, (6) interests, likes, beliefs, (7) those who say they have taken an intelligence test but are either very unclear or clearly mistaken, (8) uncodable, (9) don't know. Any response not falling into the first two categories of the above classification system implies either an erroneous understanding of the test-taking experience question or a misunderstanding of the nature of intelligence tests. However, the fact that the test actually taken by the respondent may not have been an intelligence test does not alter his perception of the test as such. Since this survey is not primarily concerned with a differentiation among the effects of different tests, we have limited our analysis to merely reporting marginal frequencies of the categories of the classification system.

For many parents their children's test scores may be of greater importance than their own. Anyone who has ever waited in line for a teacher-parent conference will testify to this. For many people, too, this is likely to be the only time that they come in contact with tests. To obtain information in regard to this matter the following question was asked:

---

* Fiske, Donald W., "The subject looks at psychological tests." Proceedings of the 1964 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems, Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1965.

> 17. "Have any of your children ever taken an intelligence, IQ, or aptitude test, for example, in school, in military service, or at work? (If YES: How often?)"

It was also considered of interest to determine how many parents personally arranged to have their children tested. The question asked was:

> 17A. "Did you or your (husband) (wife) ever personally arrange to have any of these tests given?"

From a parent who personally arranged to have his child tested one might expect two things. One, their interest in and involvement with tests should be more intense than that of other parents. Two, to the degree that the testing of their children was truly of their own choice, they should exhibit a more positive attitude toward tests. It should be understood, however, that the mere fact that a parent arranges for a test does not imply he is a free agent. His child might be in a situation where society requires parents to have their children tested.

Perceptions about intelligence and intelligence testing.

Intelligence, though hard to define, is a concept which certainly plays an important role in man's evaluation of himself and others. It is a dimension along which people measure themselves, and others. The need to compare oneself with others may be considered ubiquitous.* Intelligence test results can furnish the basis for such comparisons and it is safe to assume that most people want to know the results of tests they have taken.* If we accept this premise, then we would want to know how many people actually do find out how they do on tests. Such people may have a more positive attitude toward testing regardless of how well they did.

---

* Festinger, Leon. "A theory of social comparison processes." Human Relations, 1954, 7, 117-140.

The question asked was as follows:

> 13. "Think for a moment of the intelligence, IQ or aptitude test(s) you have taken. How clear or definite an idea did you get about your intelligence, from the test(s) you took?"

Response categories ranged from "I got a very good idea of where I stood compared to others" to "I didn't learn anything at all because I was never given any information about how well I did."

An identical question was asked in regard to the respondents' children:

> 17,B. "Did you ever receive any information about how well your children did on any of the intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests they took?"

The response categories were identical to those of question 13.

Note that the respondents were asked whether they know about their standing on the tests they had taken; they were not asked to reveal what their actual score was. In another question, however, they were asked to compare themselves to other people in intelligence:

> 22. "How do you think you compare to other people in intelligence? I am going to name some people and ask you how you compare to them. Beginning with your father, would you say that you are much higher in intelligence, higher, about the same, lower, or much lower?"

Persons listed were members of the family, e.g., "father," "mother," etc., or generalized others, e.g., "average person in the United States today," "people who do the same kind of work," etc. Responses to this item were again analyzed both in quantitative and qualitative terms. An index was formed by summing for each respondent the answers indicating that he sees himself "higher" than the comparison figures. Similarly, an index was formed in terms of "lower than" responses. This quantitative index of estimated intelligence was made more specific by obtaining similar indices for selected items. Thus, an index was constructed for "within-family" comparisons only. The index was further divided into the "Family of Procreation," i.e., spouse and children, and the "Family of Orientation," parents and siblings. Similarly, we obtained an index for non-family comparisons. In addition to indices, individual item responses were also examined for their relationship to other variables. It was particularly interesting to check out these results with some of the background variables. Do intelligence estimates, for example, differ among socio-economic classes, among ethnic groups? If there are such differences, could these account for possible differences in attitudes toward intelligence testing?

---

* It may also be argued that the desire for knowledge of test results may be suppressed by an even greater need, i.e., one to avoid failure or knowledge about failure.

Given the pervasiveness of the concept of intelligence in thinking about ourselves and about others, it becomes of interest to investigate the sources of our intelligence estimates. How do we judge out intelligence? Who tells us how intelligent we are? Does it matter who tells us? Whose word counts most? Or do we estimate our intelligence not by what others tell us but rather by our achievements, by our actions, by our accomplishments? To throw light on some of these questions the following item was included:

> 15. "Everybody has some idea of how intelligent he or she is. People get this idea in different ways. Here are some ways people decide how intelligent they are."

Some of the ways listed were "school grades," "your parent's views about your intelligence," and "success in your work." Respondents were asked to select and rank the three most important sources of their intelligence estimates. The source of greatest interest to us was, of course, "intelligence, IQ, or aptitude test scores." A selection of this category as the primary source of one's intelligence estimate would indicate the importance of intelligence tests in the formation of one's self-image.

The degree to which intelligence tests are perceived as having effects on a person's life is bound to influcnce the public's opinions and attitudes toward tests. If the effect of tests is seen as negligible, then the public's involvement with a questionnaire about such tests will be minimal. Respondents may answer because they are good-natured or conforming, but the whole issue may be assumed to leave them cold. No affect will be aroused, no protests will come forth. However, judging from the number of recent publications about this topic and their success on the open market, the issue is one about which strong feelings exist. To what degree may such feeling be based on the perception of having been affected by tests in specific situations? What, in fact, are the perceived effects of tests? The following question deals with this issue:

> 14. "Now think of all the intelligence, IQ, or aptitude tests you have taken. Do you think any of these things happened to you partly as a result of taking these tests? First ..."

A list of twenty hypothetical events accompanied the item. In ten of these, tests are seen as having had a positive influence; in ten, tests are seen as having had a negative influence. This question, like two previous ones, was again analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. Both an index of total positive effect and total negative effect were formed by summing the number of perceived effects for each respondent. Areas of maximal and minimal perceived test influence were determined by inspecting responses to each of the events separately. The institutional areas covered by the item were those which, *a priori*, one would expect to account for the largest number of test taking experiences, namely, the educational system, the work situation and the military. It was possible, then, to evaluate the relative perceived impact of tests on these different areas.

Opinions about and attitudes toward intelligence tests and testing.

The next few items represent a shift of emphasis. We are no longer concerned with intelligence *per se*, but with the instrument designed to measure and identify it. We want to know what people think about tests and about the use of tests. The first question raised deals with the problem of what it is that intelligence tests measure.

> 18. "Do you think intelligence, IQ, and aptitude tests measure the intelligence a person is born with, or what he has learned?"

What about a respondent who says that tests measure "*only inborn* intelligence," one of the response categories accompanying the question. For one thing, he must feel rather powerless *vis-à-vis* these tests. No amount of learning on his part can influence the outcome. His fate has been decided by his genetic endowment and nothing he might do can alter his performance on such tests. Is it likely that such a respondent would feel very positive about tests? One would not think so. Is it likely that such a respondent will be strongly in favor of the wide-spread use of tests? Again, not very likely. On the other hand, what might be the attitude of a respondent who sees tests as measuring "only learned knowledge?" We might suspect a more favorable attitude. After all, a person can do something about getting high scores. Using tests should also be viewed more favorably. We are rewarding people who have done something to deserve these high scores, and that is only fair.

The perceived accuracy of tests should also influence a person's attitude toward the use of tests. Only those seeing tests as accurate should be expected to favor the use of tests as they are now. To determine the respondent's opinion about this issue the following question was asked:

19. "In general, which of the following best expresses your opinion about the accuracy of intelligence, IQ, or aptitude tests?"

Response categories ranged from "*very* accurate" to "*very* inaccurate," with a "don't know or no opinion" category provided.

The next item goes back to a question about intelligence rather than intelligence tests. It is a question about the kind of intelligence measured by intelligence tests. The assumption is made that people distinguish between different kinds of intelligence. One kind would indeed be measured by tests. But there might be others. For example, one often hears the phrase, "he is smart." This kind of "smartness" may not necessarily be captured in the usual test. Or it may be an intelligence based on social grace, the ability to get along with others. There may be any number of special types of intelligence which, in fact, may be perceived to matter a great deal in life. To determine the perceived effect of *the kind of intelligence measured by tests* (and this is not to be confused with the perceived effect of tests), the following item was asked:

20. "Do you think the kind of intelligence measured by intelligence, IQ, and aptitude tests matters much in life?"

The final question in this section of the questionnaire deals with the fairness of the use of intelligence tests.

21. "Given tests as they are now, do you think it is fair to use *intelligence*, *IQ*, *or aptitude tests* to help make the following decisions?"

The decisions listed were either in the educational sphere or the work situation, although in addition there was one question on voting and one about marriage. This question represents, in effect, a referendum as to the continued use of tests in our society. Whether a referendum is desirable in this instance is a different issue and one might agree with McGehee* that the matter is one for professionals to decide and not one for the "customer" to vote on. This, however, would not reduce the desire and need to know how the public feels about the use of tests. If experts agree that tests are useful and ought to be used, then it becomes important to create a favorable climate for such a use. The best tool will not work if there is strong resentment against its application.

---

* McGehee, William. "And Esau Was an Hairy Man." *American Psychologist*, 1964, *19*, 799-804.

Orientation of respondents.

Up to this point, the questionnaire concerned itself with the respondent's test experience, his perceptions of intelligence and his opinions and attitudes about intelligence tests. It also inquired into his feelings about the fairness of the use of tests. In this section, an effort is made to relate these variables to the value orientations of the respondents. Every society has developed criteria for determining a person's position within the society. Gardner* suggests that in our society tests may fulfill such a function to an increasing degree. The person's general beliefs, then, about how a society should be organized may be expected to relate to his opinions about tests and the use of tests. Items referring to such beliefs are listed under question 23. The rationale for the use of these is given in Chapter VI and shall not be repeated here. Let us just state that we have included five items each designed to measure "intellectual elitism" and "equalitarian" attitudes, and two items measuring "aristocratic" attitudes. A discussion of each item would serve no useful purpose, for we are not interested in the content of the item, but in the underlying dimension which a response to the question is supposed to reflect.

This concludes our discussion of the questions asked in the interview. We turn next to a presentation of the results and shall begin with a listing of the response frequencies.

---

* Gardner, John W. Excellence, Can We Be Equal, and Excellent Too? New York: Harper, 1961.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS: MARGINALS

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS: MARGINALS

Experience with Intelligence Tests.

Interview responses pertaining to reported experience with tests were combined into a "Total Test Taking Experience" index, as described in Chapter III. Examination of this index revealed that 41% of the respondents reported never having taken a test of their "aptitudes, IQ, or intelligence" (Table 3). This means that 59% of the respondents reported at least one or more test taking experiences.* Note that of this proportion the majority reported having encountered tests in more than one situation.

Respondents were also asked to indicate the context within which they had taken these tests. The educational environment accounted for the largest number of test taking experiences. A third of the respondents (32%) said they had taken tests in junior high school or high school and nearly a quarter (22%) reported taking tests in elementary school (Table 4). Still another 18% reported taking tests either for college admission or for graduate school admission. The extent to which test administration has become standard procedure in industry was revealed by the fact that a quarter (25%) of the respondents reported having taken tests when applying for a job. However, tests are not only used in making decisions about hiring people. They are also used for decisions involving the internal affairs of a company: promotions, special assignments, training decisions, and so on. Evidence for the extent of such test usage may be inferred from the fact that 11% of the respondents reported taking tests while "on the job." In Military service, one is almost certain to be tested. Nearly a quarter of the respondents (23%) reported such an experience, corresponding roughly to the number of respondents who reported having been in the service (26%). Taking tests with private testing agencies or with a consulting psychologist is still a rare occurence; only 3% of the respondents reported such an experience.

---

* These findings are in general agreement with those of a recent survey by Fiske who also reported that almost two-thirds of his sample said they had taken at least one test. (Fiske, Donald W., "The subject looks at psychological tests." In Proceedings of the 1964 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems, Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1965.)

Respondents who reported having taken tests in more than one situation were asked to indicate which of these test experiences they considered most important. Table 5 indicates no one area was considered the most important. "Applying for a job" received the largest number of responses (26%), but "in connection with college admission" (16%), "in the military" (19%), and taking "tests in high school" (19%), were also chosen as most important by substantial proportions of the respondents.

Respondents were asked to describe the tests they had taken. Only 12% gave descriptions which could be clearly identified as "intelligence, IQ, or aptitude tests" (Table 6). An additional 14% spoke of intelligence tests, but their comments could not be clearly identified as such. Another 6% described what could be classified as special aptitude tests. This accounted for 32% of the respondents. Since 59% had reported taking an "intelligence, IQ, or aptitude test," we must still account for 27% of the respondents who labeled the test they had taken as an intelligence test but described it in a manner not suitable for such classification. It is possible that some of these respondents took tests other than those measuring intelligence, but still perceived them as intelligence tests. Evidence for such misperception can be found in Fiske's study.* In addition, many of the test experiences date back many years, and the respondents may well have forgotten or distorted the content of the tests.

---

* Fiske, Donald W., "The subject looks at psychological tests." In Proceedings of the 1964 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems, Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1965.

Turning now to the test taking experience of the respondents' children we find that the number who reported that their children took tests is somewhat smaller than the number of respondents who reported having taken tests themselves (Table 7). Only 55% of the respondents reported one or more tests for their children. Twenty-one per cent of the respondents were quite definite that their children had never taken a test, and another 13% did not think they had. Although some of these parents may have children who were too young to have taken tests, the results may also reflect the fact that "Many parents may not be aware of the frequency with which their children are exposed to the standardized tests throughout the first eight or nine grades, ...".*

Perceptions About Intelligence And Intelligence Testing.

We shall next concern ourselves with some of the perceptions people have about intelligence and intelligence testing.

Feedback of test results. We begin with the question of how much information a person has about his test performance. Our findings indicate that about half of the respondents had either "a pretty good idea" (25%) or "a very good idea" (26%) of where they stand compared to others, with another 19% having at least "a general idea" (Table 8). The remaining third (30%) said they learned nothing about their intelligence from taking tests, and in almost every case this was because they had not received information about how well they had done.

Over a third of the respondents (36%) whose children were tested, reported that they had learned nothing about the child's test performance (Table 9).* On the other hand, about a third (34%) said that they had "a very good idea," the balance indicating that they either had "a pretty good idea" (18%) or "only a general idea" (11%). It would seem that if the child takes a test, the parent is more likely to get no information at all than if he were to take a test himself. On the other hand, if the parent does receive information about the child's test, this information is likely to be more comprehensive than the kind of information he might get about a test he took himself. This seems to reflect an interesting philosophy on the part of the test administrators. The parent's right to have knowledge about, and thus control over, his child is recognized; this same right to knowledge and control over one's own person seems at issue.

---

* Goslin, David A. The Search for Ability: Standardized Testing in Social Perspective, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1963. p. 55.

Intelligence comparisons. We shall next report how respondents compared themselves to other people, either members of their family or some reference group other than the family. In comparing their intelligence with non-family others, the majority of respondents tended to see themselves as average and a considerable number reported themselves to be higher or much higher than average (Table 10). Very few saw themselves as lower (from 2% to 7%), and hardly any as much lower (1% in one of the four non-family items). The picture changes when respondents were asked to compare themselves with members of their family. Except for comparisons with siblings, many fewer of the respondents reported themselves the same as members of their family. Only about half saw themselves the same as their wife or husband (56%), their father (47%) or their mother (47%). Even fewer (39%) saw themselves the same as their children.

---

* Of the 660 parents who reported that their children had taken one or more tests, 7% said that they had personally arranged for such a test.

In contrast with comparisons to non-family others, more of the family comparisons tended to be on the lower side. About a third (35%) of the respondents saw themselves as lower or much lower than their children and a quarter as lower than their spouse (25%). While a considerable number considered themselves as lower or much lower than their father (17%) or mother (13%), there was also a good proportion who reported themselves as higher than their father (30%) or mother (34%). In addition, there was quite a number who saw themselves as much higher than their father and mother (6% each). More people saw themselves as lower or much lower than their children (35%) than as higher or much higher (26%).

The above findings may be summarized as follows: the majority of respondents reported that they were about equal in intelligence to non-family others; the balance tended to see themselves as above average. More differentiation occured when comparing with family members. Fewer people saw themselves the same as members of their family; larger numbers reported themselves as either higher or lower than members of their family. What might account for the difference between family and non-family comparisons? One explanation might be that the respondents in fact gave "correct" responses, but that they interpreted the category width of the comparison scale differently for each question. The "same" category in a non-family comparison might have been viewed as broader than in a family comparison. In comparison with "the average person in the United States today" it is true that most people are average. Making comparisons within the family more or less necessitates using a different scale. Also, within-family comparisons will be influenced by particular relationships, by specific interactions a person has with other individuals. Depending on the personality of both the respondents and the comparison figures involved, we would expect varying responses. Having no information about the personality of either, we are in no position to make specific predictions other than that the variance of responses will be greater. This is what we found.

Intelligence comparisons were also analyzed in terms of an index referring to the total number of "higher than" and "lower than" comparisons. (This index was described in chapter III, page 5). The majority of respondents reported at least one comparison in which they were "higher" than some other; only a quarter (25%) failed to make such a comparison (Table 11). In contrast, 39% of the respondents failed to make even a single negative comparison. Very few respondents rated themselves "higher" or "lower" than some other, more than four times. The modal number of "higher" than others was two, that of "lower" than others, one. The findings supported what was evident in our previous presentation of these data, namely that most people think like "Yogi Bear": "I am brigher than the average bear." The greater dispersion of responses in family rather than non-family comparisons was again evident in the presentation of the indices relating to these comparisons (Table 12 and 13). We found further that respondents compared themselves more favorably with their family of orientation than they did with their family of procreation (Tables 14, 15). Note that only 45% of the respondents failed to make at least one "higher" than some other comparison within the family of orientation (that is, parents and siblings), in contrast to 69% who failed to do so in the case of the family of procreation (that is, spouse and children). It is likely that each generation sees itself as brigher than the previous one, realizing, however, that it is not as bright as the one to come. The result may also reflect parents' aspirations for their children which lead them to see their children as brighter than themselves.

Sources of intelligence estimates. The next item deals with the perceived sources of intelligence estimates. Respondents were asked to pick three out of eleven alternatives and rank these in terms of their importance as sources for estimating their intelligence. The potential source of greatest interest to us was, of course, intelligence tests. However, the number of respondents who chose tests was relatively small (3%, 5% and 4% respectively for 1st, 2nd, and 3rd most important source; Tables 16A, 16B, 16C). Even if we consider only those respondents who took tests (i.e., 59%), the picture did not change radically (5%, 8% and 7% respectively). The role, then, which tests play in the formation of one's intelligence estimate would seem to be minimal. The striking feature of the data was the fact that the source quoted most frequently, both as most important (33%) and as second most important (17%), was "success in your work." More people chose this as their primary source than all of the items referring to the educational sphere combined, i.e., school grades (14%), teachers' views (5%), and extent of education (11%). This raises some interesting questions. If "success in your work" is the primary source of one's intelligence estimate, does this imply that a person estimates his intelligence only _after_ he starts working? Does a person lack an estimate up to that point, or is it vague and fluctuating until he starts working? Is the work situation a confirmation of a previously established estimate, the sources of which have been forgotten? Or was the item understood as referring not to a specific job situation, but to work in general? In that case, "success in your work" would include school achievement and, as a matter of fact, accomplishments of any kind. This may well be the explanation for the large number of responses in this category.

Perceived effects of intelligence tests. A cursory inspection of the data in regard to the perceived effects of tests might lead one to conclude that these effects were relatively slight (Table 17). In 16 of the 20 items, the "No" category contained 80% or more of the responses. In only 4 of the 20 items did the "Yes" category hold more than 15% of the responses. However, when we look at the individual items more closely, we see that the perceived effects for respondents for whom the item was appropriate was actually quite strong. For example, the first item: "Being placed in a special advanced group in grade school or high school." Only 15% of the respondents said that this happened to them partly as a result of taking tests. However, how many pupils are put in advanced groups in school? Certainly not more than 50%, most likely even fewer. Considering the relatively smaller number of respondents who actually could have had such an experience, the reported frequency looms quite large. Similarly, consider how many respondents (i.e., 6%) reported tests as instrumental to being skipped a grade. What is the percentage of students who are being skipped? Certainly not much more than six percent! Other areas where the reported frequencies seem large were the military and the job situation. In each instance, about one third of the respondents saw tests as having some influence upon their fate. Being admitted to college was similarly perceived as partly the result of taking tests by about one third (30%) of the respondents.

In the evaluation of the reported perceived effects of tests we must also consider the fact that things have changed over the years. Having advanced groups within classes is a relatively recent development. Going to college is much more common today than it was only 10 or 20 years ago. Considering that we are dealing with an adult sample, these facts make some of the reported effects even more significant. On the other hand, the tendency to skip students was more common 20 or 30 years ago than it is today. Here, the age factor deflates the significance of the finding.

Another noteworthy aspect of the above data is the fact that when a respondent saw a test as having effects on his life, these effects tended to be positive ones. Thus, tests were reported to have helped place respondents into special advanced groups in school (15%), but not into slow groups (2%); they were involved when a respondent had skipped a grade (6%), but not when he had been held back (0%). They were seen of considerable help for being admitted to college (30%), but not for not being admitted (0%). Tests affected your chances of winning a scholarship or fellowship (6%), but not your not winning one (0%). They were influential in getting a good job in the military (34%), but hardly so in being kept from a good assignment (3%). They were instrumental when being hired (34%), or promoted (17%), but much less so when not being hired (6%), or when not being promoted (2%). They mattered when deciding to try for a better job (15%), but not when not trying for one (2%).

Analysis of this item by the perceived total influence index (see page 23) revealed that the majority of respondents who had taken an intelligence test reported one or more perceived effects (Table 18). Yet, there was a large proportion (39%) who felt that the tests were relatively unimportant (or even completely unimportant) in decisions about important events in their lives. Further analysis of the data in terms of a perceived positive influence index and a perceived negative influence index confirmed what was clear from an inspection of the individual items. Nearly all of the perceived effects were positive; only about 10% of the respondents reported any negative effects, and most of these did so for only one event (Tables 19, 20).

In summary, it may be said that tests are perceived as having considerable effects in certain areas, under certain conditions, and that the kind of effects reported are mostly positive ones. One might be tempted to ascribe this latter finding to some process of denial or selective forgetting on the part of the respondent. However, another explanation of this phenomenon might be possible on a perceptual level, involving differences in the stimulus field rather than intra-personal dynamics. It may be easier to associate taking tests and positive consequences rather than taking tests and negative consequences, because positive consequences are usually concrete, specific events which contrast with what was before. The figure-ground distinction is clear. Negative test consequences may be blurred; their existence may become known only through the absence of some event; there may not be a definite point of impact.

For example, being placed into a special group in school is a positive event which stands out from the usual state of affairs. It would be associated with some immediate cause, like taking a test. Not being placed into a special group means remaining in a status quo; there never really is "an event" taking place. Thus, there is no occasion for associating a test that one might have taken, with a specific event. Similarly, being admitted to college is an event which can be associated with very specific prerequisites, some of which are passing tests. Not being admitted is not such a specific event. The student may have applied to several colleges; he may have been told that there were a combination of things which determined his rejection. As a matter of fact, it is common policy to stress the fact that any single test never constitutes grounds for rejection. It may also be, that the respondent prefers to believe that causes other than tests are at work in such instances, causes which cannot be traced directly to his performance. Or, in the case of the job situation, a positive consequence means being hired, being promoted: an event which gets celebrated, which stands out from the usual drabness of everyday life. Negative consequences, in this case, may simply imply never getting that letter of acceptance, of promotion. Nothing really ever happens. All of this, of course, is not to deny that personality dynamics are involved in the very process of perception.

Opinions About and Attitudes Toward Intelligence Tests and Testing

We shall now concern ourselves with opinions held about certain aspects of intelligence tests and testing. These will include the nature of tested intelligence, the accuracy of intelligence tests, the importance of the kind of intelligence measures by intelligence tests, and finally, the fairness of the use of intelligence tests.

The nature of tested intelligence. The first variable to be considered in this section concerns what intelligence tests measure, or more specifically, whether tests measure "inborn intelligence" or "learned knowledge." As one might expect, the majority of respondents held some compromise belief (Table 21). Very few (6%) thought that tests measure only inborn intelligence; more than twice as many (14%) said that tests measure only learned knowledge. The emphasis on learned knowledge was also reflected in the kind of compromise responses obtained. 32% of the respondents decided the answer was "mostly learned knowledge," compared to 21% who said "mostly inborn intelligence." Twenty-six percent of the respondents saw the effects of inborn intelligence and learning as about equal.

These findings, like others related to opinions about tests, are of intrinsic interest. We want to know what views people hold about tests. More important, however, is the exploration of the relationships between these opinions and experience with tests and testing. We shall deal with these in our section on cross-tabulations.

Accuracy of intelligence tests. Findings related to the question about the accuracy of intelligence tests indicated that the majority of respondents thought tests were accurate (59%), or very accurate (12%; Table 22).* Only a relatively small number felt that tests were inaccurate (14%) or very inaccurate (4%). People, in general, seem to have a rather favorable outlook concerning the accuracy of tests.

---

* It remains an open question whether respondents meant that tests are accurate in measuring what they measure, or in measuring intelligence. Are tests, in other words, seen as having high reliability or high validity?

Importance of tested intelligence. Respondents were also asked whether intelligence measured by tests matters in everyday life (Table 23). The majority believed that intelligence "matters a great deal, but no more than other things" (55%), or "more than anything else" (11%). On the other hand, a sizeable proportion felt that "it doesn't matter as much as other things (18%), or that it matters "very little" (12%). One wonders to what degree these responses reflect a trend alluded to by McNemar,* a trend which emphasizes the importance of thinking, creativity, or other personality traits such as "social skills" rather than general intelligence.

Fairness of the use of intelligence tests. Next, we had a question which dealt not with an opinion about fact but an opinion about action. We refer to the question about the fairness of the use of intelligence tests. An inspection of the data lead to several observations (Table 24). One was the fact that respondents were not overwhelmingly in favor of the use of tests. On the other hand, neither can one say that respondents were indiscriminately against the use of tests. The approval of the use of tests was clearly perceived to be a function of the context within which the tests were given. Thus, the use of tests to determine who should vote or whom one should marry was clearly rejected by the majority of respondents (86% and 89%, respectively). In contrast, nearly as high a majority (75%) approved of the use of tests for grouping children into special classes. One might even argue that a large proportion of those who express a negative opinion in these instances are reacting not against the use of tests, but against the specific use in these contexts. In other potential areas of test usage, we found large proportions of the respondents both for and against the use of tests. Such was the case regarding decisions about admission to college and the use of tests in job selection and job promotion.

---

* McNemar, Quinn. "Lost: Our Intelligence? Why?" American Psychologist, 1964, 19, 871-882.

It is interesting to note that only 37% of the respondents felt that it would be fair to use tests "to find out which children in the family should be given the most education." Clearly, some of the respondents who had approved of tests for grouping children into special classes and, by implication, giving them more education, felt hesitant in applying this universalistic criterion to members of their family.*

Orientation of Respondents

To assess the respondents' general orientation toward society, twelve attitude items were included in the questionnaire. We have grouped these items under three headings: Intellectual Elitism, Equalitarianism and Aristocratic Orientation. For a discussion of these concepts and their relevance to our study, we refer the reader to Chapter VII, Value Orientations. At this point, we merely wish to note the existence of the marginal data and let the items speak for themselves (Table 25). We shall discuss findings related to these questions in Chapter VII.

Summary of Marginals

While a considerable proportion of the respondents reported never having taken an intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests, the majority did report such an experience. If a respondent reported having been tested at all, he was more likely to have taken tests in two or more situations than in only one.

---

* Parsons, Talcott, & Bales, Robert F. Family, Socialization and Interaction Process, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.

The most likely place for taking tests was in school or college. However, both the occupational and the military sphere were not far behind as occasions for test-taking experiences. The reported test-taking experience of the respondents' children was substantial, but slightly less than that of the respondents.

The majority of respondents reported that they knew how well they did on intelligence tests compared to others. Still a majority, but somewhat fewer respondents, also reported knowledge about their children's test results. However, about one third of the respondents said they had learned nothing about the tests their children had taken. On the other hand, if parents had knowledge about their children's test results, they seemed better informed than about their own test results.

When comparing themselves in intelligence to non-family others, the majority of respondents reported themselves as average; the balance tended to see themselves as above average. When comparing themselves to family members, fewer respondents saw themselves as average or the same as members of their family. More respondents said that they were either above or below average. In general, respondents tended to compare themselves favorably rather than unfavorably with others.

Intelligence test results were reported to play only a negligible part in the person's estimate of his intelligence. "Success in work" was given as the predominant source of this estimate.

While the effects of tests were not considered to be overwhelming, their influence on a number of specific events in the respondents' lives were noted. The nature of these events were nearly always seen as positive, i.e., as helping the respondents to achieve their goals.

The majority of respondents felt that intelligence tests were more likely to measure learned knowledge than intelligence. Tests were perceived to be rather accurate. The kind of intelligence measured by tests was seen to be of considerable importance in life.

Were respondents in favor of or opposed to the use of tests? The answer seemed to be that they were both for and against tests. In certain contexts, like voting or marriage, the use of tests was seen as wholly inappropriate by a clear majority of the respondents. In other areas, like the educational or occupational environment, we found large proportions of the respondents on either side of the fence.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS: SOCIAL STRUCTURAL AND SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES

CHAPTER V

RESULTS: SOCIAL STRUCTURAL AND SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES

Let us briefly review the variables studied in this survey. First, we investigated the amount of experience people had with tests, including the extent to which people reported having taken standardized tests of ability, the kind of tests taken, and the test experience of the respondent's children. Second, we were concerned with perceptions about intelligence and intelligence testing. Here, we dealt with the feedback of test results, how respondents compared themselves with others, the sources of their intelligence estimates, and the perceived effects of tests. Third, we collected information about opinions and attitudes toward intelligence tests and testing, including the nature of intelligence, the accuracy of tests, the importance of the kind of intelligence measured by tests, and opinions about the fairness of the use of tests.

Findings pertaining to these questions have been presented in preceding pages. There, we treated our sample as an entity. Now, we shall break this entity into a number of spearate parts and observe whether the pattern for the whole remains intact for each of the parts, or, whether the parts differ among themselves. Our criteria for dividing the entity were determined by theoretical considerations. Our concern is with the social consequences of ability testing. We would want to explore, then, some of the social factors which may be related to variations in the perceived consequences of testing. For example, do men report more experience with standardized tests than do women? Do older more than younger respondents tend to rely on their test scores as an index of their intelligence? Thus, our first analysis deals with the indicators of the respondent's position in the social structure.

It also seemed desirable to examine the sample in terms of social class and social mobility differences. Do people of high income report more experience with standardized tests than those with low income? What are the relationships between social mobility and perceptions about intelligence tests? Social mobility represents change in one's place in society; intelligence tests may be used to provide or deny opportunity for such a change.

In a third analysis, we divided our sample in terms of a number of attitude dimensions. In doing so, our emphasis shifted from the descriptive to the analytical level. Why do some people favor the use of tests? Are the reasons linked to their attitudes toward tests? These considerations lead to a fourth and final analysis in terms of personality characteristics and value orientations of the respondents.

In line with the above, we will present the cross-tabulations under four headings: (1) Social structure and social class differences, (2) Social mobility differences, (3) Attitudes, and (4) Values.

For the purpose of this analysis, social background variables are treated in terms of three general categories: (1) indicators of the respondent's position in the social structure (i.e., sex, age, race, religion and political identification), (2) indices of the respondent's class position (i.e., education, occupational prestige and the Hollingshead and Redlich* Index of Social Position), and (3) social mobility indices. The distinction between social class and social structure was arbitrary, and a case can certainly be made for a high degree of correspondence between some of the variables allocated to the two categories. For example, race was treated as a social structural variable and education as a social class index, although the two are in fact highly correlated. The justification for the dichotomy is pragmatic; it has proven quite useful in the organization of our results. Both social class and social structure have been known to have effects on experience with and attitudes toward standardized tests.* It is our purpose to examine these effects further, and point to some of their implications for the use of tests in American society. Let us begin by presenting social structural and social class differences. Social mobility will be treated in a separate section at the end of this chapter.

---

* Hollingshead, August B. & Frederick C., Social Class and Mental Illness. New York: Wiley, 1958.

SOCIAL STRUCTURAL AND SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES

Experience with Intelligence Tests.

An analysis of the total test taking experience index by social structural and social class variables furnished us with data on differential exposure to standardized tests (Tables 26 and 27). Let us first consider social structure. More females (48%) than males (34%) reported that they had never taken a standardized test. More males (27%) than females (18%) reported having taken tests in three or more situations ($p < .01$).** This finding is not surprising considering the fact that the American male is still predominantly the breadwinner, and that the occupational setting accounts for a considerable part of a respondent's test taking experience. There is also the male's greater likelihood of having been in the military and his consequent exposure to tests. In fact, the relatively small difference found may be a function of the increasing number of females in the labor force.

The amount of test taking experience was more strongly related to age ($p < .01$), The majority of respondents above the age of 50 reported never having taken a test. Below the age of 50, the reverse picture was true, the majority reporting some test taking experience. This probably reflects the fact that the use of standardized tests received its greatest impetus after World War I, in the middle and late 1920's.* It was at that time that industry started to make use of tests on a large scale. We also note that the younger the respondent, the more frequently he reported having taken tests in three or more situations. Again the data show what we would have predicted. The use of tests is increasing and it appears that the taking of tests is an experience to which, very soon, few people will not have been exposed.

---

* Goslin David A., *The Search for Ability: Standardized Testing in Social Perspective*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1963.

** All probability values reported in this Technical Report are based on chi-square analyses.

The race of the respondent is clearly related to his test-taking experience ($p < .01$). Only 39% of the white respondents reported never having taken a test; 57% of the Negro respondents gave this response. Whites were also more likely to have taken tests in three or more situations. These differences may be due to the generally lower economic status of Negroes. Negroes tend to leave school earlier than white students and therefore, they tend to apply for jobs in which tests are not used, e.g., manual and domestic labor. Negroes, moreover, are more likely to live in those urban areas in which the schools, particularly the larger ones, tend to give fewer standardized tests.*

The data were also analyzed in terms of religious differences. However, because of the small number of cases involved in one of the categories (i.e., there were only 31 Jewish respondents) all findings pertaining to such differences between religious groups did not reach statistical significance, although some consistent patterns seemed to show. For these reasons we have placed all findings relating to religious differences into a special chapter in the Appendix so that they will be available as the basis for future research planning.

---

* Goslin, David A. The Search for Ability: Standardized Testing in Social Perspective, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1963.

The next variable included in our analysis was "political identification." Both amount and extent of test experience were lowest for the Democrats. Independents, on the other hand, reported the greatest amount and the greatest extent of test experience ($p < .02$). Republicans took a middle position, being somewhat closer to the Democrats than to the Independents. We know that the independent voter tends to be the better educated one. This fact may be one possible explanation of the differences found. Independents tended to fall into a higher social class then Democrats, according to the Hollingshead index of social class. Independents and Republicans tended to fall in Class II, whereas Democrats were more prevalent in Classes III and IV. It would seem that other factors must be mediating the relationship. One might think, for example, of the independent voter as one who is less conforming, more curious and desirious of new experiences, some of which might involve taking tests.

Turning to social class, we find that these variables indeed exert a significant effect ($p < .01$) on test-taking experience (Table 27). Only a small minority of the highest social class (about 10%) reported never having taken any tests. In contrast, the large majority of the lowest class (about 65% to 80%) said that they had never taken any tests in the situations listed. Moreover, if a member of the lowest class did report such an experience, it tended to be limited to one or two contexts, whereas the upper class respondent was likely to have had such an experience in three or more contexts. Both of these findings occured, to lesser degrees, throughout the range of social class. The only exception was occupational prestige where we found a reversal for Category 3, administrative personnel, small independent businessmen and minor professionals. This group showed less test-taking experience than did clerical and sales workers, technicians, owners of small businesses and skilled manual employees. A possible explanation of this finding might be that respondents in Category 3 are older than those in Categories 4 and 5, and we already know that age is negatively related to amount of test taking experience: or that tests are used less often in the occupations in Category 3.

Test-taking experiences in specific contexts. We turn next to an investigation of the effects of social background on the likelihood of having had test-taking experiences in different situations. We have considered three potential classes of test administration environments: the educational situation, the occupational situation and a miscellaneous category, including the military and private testing services. In general, the effects of social background variables reported for total test-taking experience are paralleled in each of the individual contexts (Tables 28A, 28B, 28C, 29A, 29B, 29C). However, there were some exceptions to the general pattern. For example, more males reported experience with tests on the job ($p < .01$), during military service ($p < .01$), and in private testing services ($p < .01$), but more females reported test experience in secondary schools ($p < .05$), and in elementary school (though nonsignificant). This might suggest that females tend to get more tests in school than males -- not a likely possibility. A more plausible explanation is that tests taken in school remain more salient for females, partly because they are not overshadowed by tests taken in other contexts and partly because the school situation represents a more significant aspect of the female's life.

The effects of race were consistent across all nine contexts of testing: Negroes reported fewer test-taking experiences than whites in all of them ($p < .05$). The effects of political identification, too, were similar across the various test situations, with somewhat more independent voters reporting test-taking experience than either Democrats or Republicans.

With minor exceptions, the influence of social class was unequivocal in each of the testing situations. Respondents from the upper class reported more test-taking experiences than did those from the lower classes. A deviation from this trend occured in Category 4 of the occupational scale. We have seen that respondents in Category 3 reported fewer test-taking experiences than did those in Category 4. The relatively greater frequency in this category is accounted for by the fact that it contains the largest proportion of respondents taking tests in elementary school and also in connection with job applications. Category 4, which includes clerical and sales workers, had a preponderance of females (68%), and we already know that females tend to report more test experience in elementary schools. Moreover, job hiring for the kinds of jobs involved in Category 4 is quite likely to involve test administrations.

Another deviation from the overall trend occurred for respondents who where high school graduates. These respondents reported the highest proportion of tests in connection with job application ($p < .01$). This finding may reflect the tendency of high school graduates to enter white-collar occupations where standardized testing is frequently used for employment selection. Fifty-seven per cent of the respondents who were high school graduates were classified as holding white-collar type occupations.

The data presented up to this point suggest that a person's social background affects the degree to which he will be exposed to tests. Do these same factors, however, extend their influence to the respondent's children? Does their exposure to tests also vary by structure and social class? One would expect a certain amount of influence, but on the whole, the differentiation between classes, or between races should be much smaller for children for at least two reasons. One, the trend toward integration in our school system should bring about an equalizing effect; two, even where schools are segregated we would expect schools to become more homogeneous. These expectations were confirmed. There were no significant sex differences between respondents who reported that their children never took any tests (Table 30). Somewhat more females (58%) than males (50%) reported at least one test for their children; and somewhat more males (14%) than females (8%) did not know whether their children had taken a test ($p < .05$). This result probably reflects the greater involvement of mothers in the life of their children. With respect to age, more parents between 41 and 50 tended to report tests than any of the other age groups. The youngest age group constituted the smallest proportion reporting test-taking experience for their children; they probably had few school-age children. The older groups also reported fewer tests. However, the decrease here seems to be related to the "don't know" category. Thus, for the older group two factors may be operating: (1) they had their children when standardized testing was the exception rather than the rule, and (2) they may not remember.

More Negroes (48%) than whites (32%) reported that their children never took a test ($p < .01$). Negroes also reported fewer tests for their children than for themselves, due to the relatively high proportion who said that they did not know whether their children had taken a test (18%). Political preference of the respondent did not relate significantly to the reported test-taking experience of the respondent's children.

Each of the social class indices showed a direct relationship with the number of tests reported for the respondent's children (Table 31). Again, the findings parallel those for the respondent's own test taking experience.

If we consider the few respondents (i.e., a total of 49) who personally arranged to have their children tested, we find that 21- to 30-year old parents, and respondents from the upper classes tended to be the ones who had their children tested ($p < .01$), as Tables 32 and 33 show. In generalizing from these findings one should keep in mind the small number of cases involved.*

Perceptions About Intelligence and Intelligence Testing.

We have seen that there are differences in the degree to which certain strata of society are exposed to tests. Let us know check to what degree there also exist differential perceptions about intelligence and intelligence testing. We shall first examine feedback of test results, then intelligence comparisons, followed by sources of intelligence estimates and, finally, perceived effects of tests.

Feedback of test results. To gain knowledge about one's standing on tests compared to others requires some kind of communication with the test administrator. It also requires a willingness on the part of the tester to furnish this information. While this issue has been a much debated one, the trend has generally been one of giving more information to the public.** The question which remains to be examined is whether this trend applies to the different strata of society.

An inspection of Table 34 revealed that males, in general, reported greater clarity about test results than did females ($p < .01$). Testing the idea that males might consider intelligence to be of greater importance in life, and therefore be more motivated to get information, we checked sex differences in responses to the question about the importance of tested intelligence (Table 49). No significant sex differences were found.

---

*Perceived effects of test taking will be discussed later, but we want to mention here that no relationship was found between perceived effects of tests and the respondent being personally responsible for having his child tested.

**Goslin, David A., The Search for Ability: Standardized Testing in Social Perspective, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1963, p. 179.

There did not seem to be any systematic relationship between knowledge of test results and age. Neither was there a difference between white and Negro respondents. This finding takes on added significance when we note the relationship between social class and reported clarity about test results (Table 35). The highest class had a better idea about their intelligence, and received more information than the lower classes. The reverse was true for the lowest class, although these differences were nonsignificant.

These relationships are more pronounced for the respondent's knowledge about his child's test performance ($p < .01$). While about half of the respondents in the lowest class reported never having received information regarding test results, this proportion is closer to 14% for the upper class (Tables 36, 37). Only about a third of the respondents of the lowest class reported "having a good idea" about their children's test performance, whereas about three quarters of the upper class respondents did report "having a good idea." It is quite evident that the upper classes receive more feedback and are better informed about test results than the lower classes. Unfortunately, we do not have information about the parents' desire for test results, and how this desire might fluctuate as a function of social class.* The implication of the finding could be as follows. Either lower class parents have less desire for feedback--then this lack of information should not present a problem to them--or they have an equal desire but find their search for information blocked.

Intelligence comparisons. Analyses of intelligence comparisons were carried out in terms of the "total number of higher" and the "total number of lower" comparison index (see page 22). Findings indicate no substantial difference between males and females in the number who estimate their intelligence as higher than some other. There is, however, a greater tendency ($p < .01$) for females to report lower estimates for themselves (Table 38). Whether this represents false modesty--superior intelligence is unfeminine--or whether their submissive role has actually lead them to believe that they are less intelligent than the dominant male, remains an open question.

---

*Responses to the question about the importance of tested intelligence indicated that the lower classes in fact thought that intelligence was more important than did the upper classes (Table 51).

In general, the younger respondents had a somewhat higher estimate of their intelligence than did older individuals, although the differences were by no means significant. Again, somewhat surprisingly, we found no differences between white and Negro respondents. This is the more significant since social class is strongly related to estimates of intelligence. One can only conclude that within a given social class Negroes must have higher estimates than whites. On all indices of social class, the upper categories reported more favorable intelligence estimates and fewer unfavorable ones; for the lowest categories the findings were reversed (Table 39).

The striking finding in this section on intelligence comparisons is the reported differences between social classes. If we take these comparisons to reflect estimates of intelligence, then the upper classes certainly estimate themselves as brighter than the lower classes (which would in fact be correct). However, our findings do not imply that members of the upper class are necessarily aware of the fact that they estimate their intelligence as higher than that of the lower class, or vice versa. Respondents were not asked to rate themselves in terms of class comparisons but in terms of people they feel superior to. Our intelligence estimate of the respondent is based on the number of such favorable comparisons and no respondent knew how many comparisons any other respondent was going to make.

Sources of Intelligence Estimates. We have seen that people use different sources for their estimate of intelligence. Most seem to depend on "success in their work;" others use their school marks or what people say about them. Some even rely on intelligence tests. We shall now examine to what degree these different sources of estimates are related to the background of the respondents.

Let us consider sex differences first (Table 40). While both sexes followed the general trend and most frequently reported success in their work as their most important source, significantly more males than females did so ($p < .01$). This might reflect the greater amount of work experience among males, but also the greater importance of occupational success for men in our society. In contrast, a greater number of women than men listed school grades as their most important source ($p < .01$). This finding is in accord with previous results which showed that school experience was more salient for females. Females, moreover, tend to be more successful academically than males in the pre-college grades, and therefore may be more likely to use grades as a means of estimating their intelligence. Although intelligence test scores were used infrequently by either sex, there was a slight tendency for men to refer more often to intelligence tests as a source for their estimates. However, males also reported having taken more intelligence tests, and this may be the simple explanation of the difference found.

All age categories listed work success most frequently as their primary source, followed by school grades and education. However, as one might expect, the younger the respondents, the greater was their emphasis on grades ($p < .01$), and parent's and teachers' veiws of their intelligence ($p < .01$). The older respondents tended to rely more heavily on work success. Also, the younger the respondent, the more frequently he listed test scores as a primary source, although the number of respondents using this source was small.

Differences between whites and Negroes in preferred sources of intelligence estimates were relatively small, although they seemed to follow a pattern. More whites than Negroes use school grades, success in work, test scores and education. More Negroes than whites use parent's and teachers' estimates, and comparisons with others ($p < .01$). One might argue that Negroes tend to prefer that source which involves comparisons with other Negroes. The work of Katz* has demonstrated that Negroes function less effectively when they are performing in a condition where the reference group is white. A reliance on Negroes as a reference group may thus constitute an adaptive mechanism. Of course, one may also argue that Negroes have less interest in, and opportunity for academic pursuits, and that they have less opportunity to excell in education or business. However, it may be these very conditions which force the Negro to make the choice as they do.

There were no major differences between respondents of different political preference, except that somewhat more Republicans and Independents compared to Democrats chose success in work as their primary source ($p < .05$). It will be remembered that Independents and Republicans were more successful in their work, if their higher social status is taken as an index of success.

Regardless of social class position, success in work was used consistently as the main source of estimates (Table 41). However, respondents from the upper social classes tended to use success in work, as well as education, grades and test scores more frequently than did lower class respondents. The lower class respondents relied more heavily on opinions of others and comparisons with others ($p < .01$). The relationship is similar to the one reported for whites and Negroes, and a similar argument in terms of achieved success and maintenance of an effective self-concept could well be made here.

---

* Katz, Irwin. "Review of evidence relating to effects of integration on the intelligence performance of Negroes." American Psychologist, 1964, 19, 381-399.

From all of these relationships we may draw the generalization that people tend to choose those sources which yield the highest estimate of their intelligence. Thus, we see that the lower class respondents depended more on "estimates of significant others," while those in the upper classes preferred "performance criteria" such as occupational success and school grades.*

Perceived effects of intelligence tests. We found that the majority of respondents who had taken intelligence tests reported that their life had been influenced by this event. However, a substantial number (39%) reported that their test taking experience had no consequences on important decisions in their life (see Table 18). Let us now see whether there were differences in these perceived consequences of test taking which are related to social structural and social class variables.

In general, we found no substantial relationship between social structural variables and the perceived consequences of testing (Table 42). Small deviations from the general pattern did occur but they did not seem consistent. The picture is different when we look at social class variables (Table 43). Over half of the respondents on the lower end of the social class continuum saw themselves as unaffected by the test experience ($p < .01$). In contrast, four-fifths of the respondents in the highest social class reported one or more effects of having taken a test. And the higher the class, the more effects were being reported. We have here what appears to be a powerful relationship. The findings doubtless reflect the fact that the upper classes have more opportunity to be affected by tests. The upper class respondent is more likely than the lower class respondent to apply for college admission, to apply to a better college, to win a scholarship, etc., and in each of these instances tests may have been perceived as instrumental in reaching the goal. On the other hand, it is also possible that the test experiences of the lower class respondents tend to be negative. Since these respondents have a lower education, they are more likely to "fail" on such tests. As a consequence, their test experience will tend to be unpleasant ones and may well be supressed. We cannot tell the relative contribution of experience and perception to these social class differences in reported effects, but we suspect that both factors are operative.*

---

* Forty-one per cent of the respondents reported never having taken an intelligence test. Those who reported that they took a test varied in the degree to which they were clear about their test performance. It could be argued that both of these facts led to the small number of respondents reporting test scores as their source of intelligence estimates. To check on this possibility, we examined the relationship of knowledge about test results and preferred source of estimate for those respondents who reported having taken a test. There was a positive relationship between knowledge of test result and intelligence tests as the preferred source. However, even those respondents who had a good idea how well they did on tests used test scores only rarely (8%) as a primary source of estimate. Thus, the relationship between knowledge of test results and the use of tests as the basis for an estimate is still minimal.

Data for "perceived positive influence" parallel those reported for "perceived total influence" and therefore they were not presented separately. The number of respondents reporting "perceived negative influence" was too small to warrant a meaningful cross-tabulation.

---

* In the preceding footnote we have shown that knowledge of test results has some effect on the use of tests as the basis for an intelligence estimate. A similar analysis was undertaken to demonstrate the effect of the perceived importance of tests on the use of tests for intelligence estimates. One might argue that respondents who perceive tests to have effects on their life would be more likely to use tests as a source of their estimate. This possibility was tested (Table 44) and found to be correct. The number of perceived effects related positively to the frequency of reporting test scores as a source of one's intelligence estimate. This relationship could, of course, be mediated by a social class factor. The test of such a possibility would require a three way analysis and may be done at some later date. In any event, even with maximal perceived effects, the use of tests as an estimate was restricted to a small proportion of the respondents (11%).

Opinions About and Attitudes Toward Intelligence Tests and Testing.

The data have shown that there is a wide range of opinions about intelligence tests and testing in the general population. The variations in attitude may relate to the social background of the respondents. If different sections of society have different ideas about the usefulness of tests in promoting their goals, we may assume concomitant differential attitudes in regard to tests, according to the "instrumental" view of attitudes.* Similarly, if respondents in different strata of society have different belief systems, we also may expect different attitudes in regard to tests. Any one attitude a person holds tends to relate to the total belief structure the person has developed over the years. Clearly, then, we should expect to find background related variations in attitudes towards tests.

Nature of intelligence. Opinions about what intelligence tests measure ranged from a belief that they measure only inborn intelligence to one which holds that they measure only what a person has learned. In general, nurture received more credit than nature. Males stressed the learning aspect of intelligence significantly more than females (Table 45). Although the difference was not large, females were more likely to see intelligence tests as measuring inborn intelligence and learning about equally ($p < .05$). Similarly, the younger the respondent, the more likely he was to think that tests measure learned knowledge; the older, the more likely he was to think they measure inborn intelligence ($p < .01$). It may be that most people associate "learning" with school; the knowledge acquired through every day experience and even through work experience may not be associated with "learning." The younger person is closer to school. His "intelligence" is linked with what he just learned, and if tests measure his intelligence they must measure what he has learned. The older person no longer sees his "intelligence" as linked with school. Besides, he is also likely to have had less education than the younger generation. Thus, if tests measure his intelligence they cannot deal with just what he had learned. They must measure something else, possibly his inborn intelligence.

---

* Katz, Daniel & Stotland, Ezra. "A preliminary statement to a theory of attitude structure and change." In Sigmund Koch (ed.)., Psychology: A study of a science. Volume 3., New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

More Negroes (37%) than whites (26%) felt that tests measure inborn intelligence ($p < .01$), while more whites than Negroes saw tests measuring inborn intelligence and what is learned about equally; nearly the same number of Negroes as whites thought that tests measure what is learned. Political preference did not relate significantly to opinions about the nature of intelligence.

Social class indices showed a fairly consistent pattern. Table 46 shows that the lower the social class the greater is the belief that intelligence tests measure inborn intelligence ($p < .02$). One interesting exception seemed to be Occupational Prestige, Categories 1 and 2. The majority of respondents in Category 1 (51%) felt that tests measure what is learned, whereas many fewer respondents in Category 2 held this opinion (38%). These respondents were more likely to consider intelligence tests as measuring about equally what is learned and what is inborn.

Accuracy of intelligence tests. The findings in regard to perceived accuracy of tests show no substantial differences in any of the social structural or social class indices (Tables 47, 48). The only exception was political preference which showed a slight difference. Independents (26%) were somewhat more likely to see tests as inaccurate than either Republicans (23%) or Democrats (18%).

Importance of tested intelligence. Does the kind of intelligence measured by intelligence tests matter much in life? There were no major significant differences in response patterns related to the social structural and social class indices (Tables 49, 50). Age showed a slight curvilinear trend. Both the young and the very old were more likely to feel that tested intelligence matters little. Slightly more Negroes (74%) than whites (68%) felt that tested intelligence matters a lot. More Democrats (72%) than Republicans (63%) or Independents (65%) were also of that opinion.

Fairness of the use of intelligence tests. The relative justice attributed to the use of tests may be seen as an issue of legitimacy, or appropriateness. For example, if one wished to determine the person with the highest scholastic aptitude among a group of people, almost everyone would agree that the use of an intelligence test for this purpose would be appropriate, i.e., fair and just. On the other hand, to give an intelligence test to contestants in an athletic contest may be considered illegitimate. One might suspect, however, that different strata of society have different ideas about what is legitimate in any given situation. To examine this possibility, items dealing with the fairness of the use of tests were analyzed by social structural and social class variables.

Examination of the data showed no major sex or age differences (Tables 51A, 51B), and no significant differences between whites and Negroes in perceptions of the fairness of using tests. Moreover, the political preference of the respondents did not relate to their feelings about the fairness of the use of tests.

Responses to the item dealing with the fairness of the use of tests, as analyzed by social class indices, demonstrated the need for asking complete and comprehensive questions on this issue. It just would not have been enough to ask whether a respondent is "for or against" the use of tests. Only when we specify the context of the test use do we see that respondents made important discriminations which interacted with social class. Thus, in one context (e.g., "special classes") social class is positively related to approval of tests (Tables 52A, 52B). The higher the class, the more the respondent is in favor of the use of tests. (This trend is not statistically significant). In another context (e.g., "job promotion"), however, the situation was exactly the reverse; the higher the social class, the less was the respondent in favor of the use of tests ($p < .01$).

We also found that among the three indices of social class, education seemed to provide the sharpest discrimination. The index of occupational prestige, on the other hand, showed less clear-cut patterns. For example, respondents with high occupational prestige tended to see tests as fair in the "college entrance" context. However, respondents in Categories 2 and 3, and even in Category 6 (low prestige) were nearly as positive in their evaluation. In regard to "who is to receive most education," nearly half (47%) of the highest prestige group thought tests to be fair. The second highest group, on the other hand, showed the lowest number of respondents who felt this way about tests.

Social Mobility Differences

In this section, we discuss the effects of social mobility, although for reasons to be described shortly, we do not present the results in detail. Two types of social mobility indices were constructed. One was a generational index, i.e., a discrepancy score between the respondent's status and that of his father. The other was an index of mobility through marriage, i.e., a discrepancy score between the status of the respondent's father-in-law and that of the respondent's father. Three kinds of mobility were considered: discrepancies based on educational level, occupational prestige, and the index of social position. This accounts for six indices of mobility. Each of these had a 9-point range (from -4 to +4), but to facilitate interpretation, the three extreme categories were combined into "upward mobility" and "downward mobility" respectively, leaving the three intermediate points as a "no mobility" category.

An inspection of the distribution of respondents on the generational mobility indices reveals greater upward mobility than downward mobility. This, of course, comes as no great surprise, for it is generally recognized that the trend in a growing industrial society such as the United States is toward more specialized jobs, requiring more training and carrying greater prestige. Similarly, the great increase in educational opportunities would contribute to this effect, and in fact the result is strongest for scores based on the educational discrepancy between father and son (Table 53). (Such a general generational upward mobility does not, of course, imply that the son would rank higher in social class compared to his peers than would the father compared to his peers). The numbers of upwardly and downwardly mobile respondents through marriage (Table 54) are about equal and relatively small. (Cinderella--and her male counterpart--is still the exception rather than the rule).

It has been our intention to use these indices to investigate relationships between social mobility, test experience and attitudes toward tests. One might expect such relationships since mobility reflects social change and tests may be the cause of the change. It is probably true, however, that mobility and social class are correlated. The upwardly mobile person (generational) will tend to be of higher social class than the downwardly mobile person. Similarly, the person who marries into the lower class family will tend to be of a higher social class than the person who marries into the upper class family. Cross-tabulations of social class by social mobility indices, both generational and through marriage, did in fact reveal strong relationships between the two sets of variables (Tables 55A, 55B, 55C, 56A, 56B, 56C). Subjects who were upwardly mobile (generational) were not represented in the two lowest categories of each index of social class, and subjects who were downwardly mobile (generational) were not represented in the two highest categories. The relationship between mobility through marriage and social class was neither as strong nor as consistent. However, the small number of cases involved made cross-tabulation unfeasible. Our data, then required that we control social class to study the effects of social mobility on the variables included in this survey. This was done, considering only the 3 upper levels of social class and comparing respondents who have been classified as either upward-or non-mobile, within each of these levels. No significant relationships between generational social mobility and test taking experience was found. A similar test of the relationship between generational social mobility and most important source of one's intelligence estimate also failed to show significant findings. These two variables had been selected for a check on the possible relationship with social mobility, when controlling for social class, as they had been the only ones showing such a relationship when not controlling for social class.

Summary of Social Structural and Social Class Differences

In this chapter, we have examined the influence of social structural and social class variables on the respondent's experience with and attitudes toward intelligence tests. We shall now summarize our findings in regard to each of the independent variables. All findings mentioned are statistically significant unless indicated otherwise.

Sex. The male respondent has taken more tests, and in more contexts, than his female counterpart. The only exception is the school situation where the female reports greater test experience than the male. The male is somewhat better informed about his standing on intelligence tests relative to others.

The female does not differ substantially from the male in the number of others to whom she feels superior in intelligence. However, she reports a larger number of others to whom she feels inferior. While both male and female tend to use success in work as their primary source of an intelligence estimate, the male is more likely to do so, and the female is more likely than the male to use school grades. The male respondent is more likely to stress the learned aspect of intelligence, when asked about its nature.

Age. The younger respondents have more test experience, and in more contexts than the older respondents. They are more likely to use grades and parent's and teacher's views as sources of their intelligence estimates. In their intelligence estimates, they are more likely to feel that intelligence tests measure what is learned rather than what is inborn.

Race. The white respondent is likely to have greater test experience, and in more contexts, than the Negro. There were no apparent differences in the clarity of the feedback, nor in the intelligence comparisons made. The white respondent is more likely to use performance criteria as a source of his intelligence estimate; the Negro prefers to use opinions of significant others. The white is more likely to feel that intelligence tests measure what is learned; the Negro is more likely to feel that they measure inborn intelligence.

Political Preference. This variable has an effect only on test experience. A Democratic respondent is likely to have less test experience than a Republican, and much less than an Independent voter.

Social Class Indices. The effects here were quite strong and consistent. A member of the lower class is much less likely to have taken a test. His experience also tends to be limited to fewer contexts. He is less likely to be told much about his children's test results. He tends to estimate his intelligence as inferior and relies on opinions of significant others rather than on success in work as sources for estimating his intelligence. The lower class respondent is more likely to think that what tests measure is inborn intelligence. The picture in regard to the fairness of the use of tests is more complicated. For some contexts (e.g., "special classes") the upper class respondent is more likely to be in favor of the use of tests than the lower class respondent (although these differences do not reach statistical significance). For others (e.g., "job promotion") the situation is reversed (and differences are statistically significant). This demonstrates the need to specify the context when talking about a person's approval or disapproval of the use of tests.

Social Mobility Indices. Social mobility correlates strongly with social class. As our data did not permit effective control of social class, the attempt to relate social mobility to the variables studied was abandoned.

CHAPTER VI

RESULTS: ATTITUDES AND VALUES

CHAPTER VI

RESULTS: ATTITUDES AND VALUES

Attitudes

A number of questions asked in the interview dealt with attitudes toward intelligence and intelligence testing. The questions were asked to furnish information which might contribute to the basis for policy decisions in regard to ability testing. Take, for example, the opinions held about the accuracy of tests. If tests are in fact highly accurate, but are perceived as inaccurate, an educational campaign might be indicated to let the public know that tests are accurate. On the other hand, if tests in fact are somewhat inaccurate, but are perceived as accurate, the public might be educated against over-confidence in tests.

The attitude questions may serve a second purpose. They may be used to throw light on the relationship which exists among various opinions and between the person's experience with tests and his opinions about them. While such patterns of interrelationship do not necessarily constitute causality, they lead to a better understanding of the dynamics involved in the formation of such attitudes and beliefs. To use the above example as an illustration, the person's attitude toward the fairness of the use of tests may, in part, be a function of his opinion about the accuracy of tests.

Accuracy of Intelligence Tests

Let us start by comparing the person who thinks tests are accurate with one who thinks that they are inaccurate. Table 57 shows that the person who thinks tests are accurate is more likely to have a good idea where he stands in intelligence compared to others, and is less likely to have received no information about his test performance ($p < .01$). He is also more likely

($p < .05$) to see his life as having been affected by test results (Table 58). If one perceives tests as inaccurate, would one want to have one's life affected by them? Table 58 shows that even the person who thinks tests are inaccurate is likely to report some perceived effects of tests.

Respondents who felt that tests are inaccurate should be less likely to approve of their use. This was indeed the case. Fewer of the respondents who saw tests as inaccurate rather than accurate ($p < .01$) approve of the use of tests for decisions regarding college entrance, special classes, who is to receive most education, job hiring and job promotion (Tables 59A, 59B). Though no differences were found in regard to voting and marriage decisions, the number of respondents who approve of tests in these areas is too small to draw unequivocal conclusions.

The nature of tested intelligence. What about the person who thinks that tested intelligence is inborn compared with one who believes that tested intelligence is learned? Do differences in regard to these opinions relate to one's knowledge about test results, to the perceived effect of tests, or to beliefs about the fairness of the use of tests? Surprisingly, our findings do not show any significant relationships between these variables. This may mean that there are in fact no relationships, or that they are hidden by the effects of moderating variables. For example, people who believe that tested intelligence is inborn, but are low in intelligence, may be opposed to the use of tests. On the other hand, people who believe that tested intelligence is inborn, and are higher in intelligence, may favor the use of tests. Were we able to divide people in terms of high and low intelligence, we might discover that there is a relationship between opinions about the nature of tested intelligence and beliefs about the fairness of the use of tests, but that this relationship runs in opposite directions for different types of people.

Importance of tested intelligence. We have seen that some respondents believe that whatever it is that tests measure, it has little effect on one's chances for success in life. Others held the opposite view, namely, that what tests measure matters a great deal. More of the respondents for whom it mattered ($p < .05$) had a good idea about their test results, and fewer received no information about their test scores (Table 57). It is not surprising that the person who views tested intelligence as important is a better informed person. This is an instance where one is tempted to point to a causal relationship, since the test-taker's view of the importance of tests should cause him to seek out information about his performance.

The person who sees tested intelligence as important should be more likely to perceive test results as affecting his life. The data in Table 58 support this line of reasoning, although the differences are not as large as one would have expected ($p < .05$). For example, 44% of the respondents for whom tested intelligence matters little reported no perceived effects of tests, compared to 35% of the respondents for whom tested intelligence mattered.

If tested intelligence matters a lot in life, does it follow that one approves of the use of tests? The data in Tables 59A and 59B indicate quite strongly that this is the case ($p < .01$). Respondents who see tested intelligence as mattering a lot are much more likely to be in favor of the use of tests, regardless of the context of the test administration.

Fairness of test use. We know that nearly all perceived effects of tests are positive effects: being admitted to college, being put into a special class, being hired, promoted, etc. These events are admittedly "good things" and they should predispose people favorably toward tests. Thus, we would expect that respondents who reported a larger number of perceived effects would tend to be more favorable toward the use of tests. This prediction, however, was not confirmed by our data (Table 60). There are some minor trends in the predicted direction but they are neither consistent nor substantial.

Sources of intelligence estimates. Whether or not a person approves of the use of intelligence tests will depend on many things. Aside from methodological considerations, i.e., questions of reliability and validity, it will certainly depend on his concept of intelligence. A disagreement about the meaning of intelligence might account for a large part of the disagreement about the use of tests. A dimension which seems likely to be related to an individual's concept of intelligence is the source he chooses to estimate his intelligence. An individual using success in work as his source is likely to view intelligence differently from one who uses success in interpersonal relationships or one who uses intelligence scores as his source.

The relationship of one's source of intelligence estimate and one's attitude toward the use of tests was investigated (Tables 61A, 61B). Let us restate here the distribution of attitudes toward the use of tests. The following proportion of the respondents approved of the use of tests: for College Admission 55%; for Special Classes 75%; Who Is To Receive Most Education 37%; Job Hiring 58%; Job Promotion 46%.* Two very interesting findings appear. One is the fact that respondents who base their intelligence estimates on school grades are least likely to approve of the use of tests regardless of the context involved. Note that the differences are not great and that the majority of respondents approve of tests in three of the five situations. Yet, in comparison to people who base their intelligence estimates on other sources, these respondents are consistently less likely to think that the use of tests is fair. On the other hand, respondents who base their intelligence estimates on test results furnish, proportionally, the largest number of those who approve of the use of tests. The only exceptions are "who is to receive most education" and "job promotion." Here, it is the respondent who bases his estimate on his children's intelligence who is most likely to be in favor of tests.

---

*We have eliminated the "Voting" and "Marrying" categories from this discussion because of the small number of cases involved.

Let us attempt an explanation of these findings. First, we see that respondents who base their intelligence estimates on school grades are least likely to approve of tests. We argued previously that people use that source which will give them the highest estimate of their intelligence. If that is true, we may assume that those respondents who use school grades as their source are respondents who in fact had good grades. Could it be that these people now perceive tests as a threat? Their self-image is one of high intelligence based on information derived from school grades. Suddenly, they are confronted with the prospect of having to take tests. Maybe they will find that they are not as intelligent as they thought. This thought may be supressed, but the antagonism toward tests remains and is expressed in disapproval in all contexts. Now, look at the respondent who uses test results to form his intelligence estimate. Again, we may assume that he uses the best possible source. But he has nothing to fear. He did well on tests the first time he took them, hence he is in favor of the use of tests.*

Values

Intelligence testing is an issue toward which many people have taken a stand. A person may not have consciously worked out his position, but it is probable that testing will constitute a portion of his universe of "attitude objects." While it is possible to hold attitudes which are, at least on the surface, contradictory, it is generally accepted that there is a trend toward consistency operating which will lead a person to hold those views which are most congruent with each other.* Thus, the attitudes a person holds with regard to tests and testing will tend to be in line with his total belief systems, with his general orientation toward society and the world at large.

---

*One of the exceptions to the above is the category "who is to receive most education." We suggest that in this instance the respondent cannot be sure how his child will perform on tests and so he is not so sure about the use of tests in this context. Of course, if his child happens to be brilliant (and in which case he uses his child's intelligence as his source) he would be all for the use of tests, even in this context. The second exception, "job promotion," remains unexplained. Why should respondents who use their children's intelligence as a source be more in favor of tests for job promotion?

The development of ability tests and their extensive use has coincided with increasing recognition of the importance of individual differences in ability and performance. Both of these developments are a consequence of the fact that American society has moved away from a structure based on hereditary privilege. Gardner ** has postulated two ways in which a society which gives up hereditary stratification may deal with individual differences in ability and performance. "One way is to limit or work against such individual differences, protecting the slow runners and curbing the swift. This is the path of equalitarianism. The other way is simply to 'let the best man win'" (p. 5). These two approaches lead to values which are contradictory, yet likely to exist in the same society and even in the same individual. We do not wish to, nor need to, go into the ways in which a society or an individual manages to cope with these inconsistencies. Horney,*** among others, has discussed this topic at length. We need to refer to these basic orientations only as they have reference to our particular study.

---

* Zajonc, Robert B. "Balance, congruity, and dissonance." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960, 24, 280-296.

** Gardner, John W. Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too? New York: Harper, 1961, pp. 47-48.

*** Horney, Karen Neurotic Personality of Our Times. New York: Norton, 1937.

Following Gardner,* we distinguish three such orientations. The first may be called aristocratic, i.e., the belief in hereditary privilege remains. The person holding such a view is likely to favor the status quo; a status which is threatening to disappear or in fact has already disappeared. The second orientation, equalitarianism, is epitomized by the slogan "all men should be equal." Equality is interpreted to extend beyond men's rights to his abilities and potentials. The third orientation, which we have labelled intellectual elitism, represents the opposite extreme. There is an overemphasis on individual achievement through personal striving and competition. We have deviated somewhat from Gardner's conception of this orientation. Gardner stresses competitive performance, in general. The able youngster of humble beginnings may rise to the top through his personal achievement, whatever this may be. We are emphasizing the intellectual aspects of individual ability and performance, hence we have called it intellectual elitism.

A person who holds one of these three value orientations may be assumed to differ in his attitudes toward tests and testing. The aristocratic person may view tests as an unnecessary nuisance. He might even consider them a threat to his privileged position. His general attitude toward tests would be negative; he would not approve of the use of tests.

The position of the equalitarian person is somewhat ambiguous. He might object to tests on the ground that they tend to overemphasize individual achievement. Tests differentiate people and help sort them into classes. On the other hand, tests can be used to assure equal standards. They may be used to identify those who are below par in order to raise them to the level of at least the average. Thus, we may expect some negative feeling toward tests from the equalitarian persons, but this feeling should be much less pronounced than it is in the aristocratic person.

---

*Gardner, John W. Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too? New York: Harper, 1961.

The person who ascribes to intellectual elitism, on the other hand, would be expected to be in favor of tests. Tests are the very tools which help him maintain his superior status. They are necessary to distinguish him from the common man.

A number of questions were included in the study which, a priori, seem related to the orientations just described (See Table 25). We make no assumption that the items within each group (i.e., the intellectual elitism, the equalitarian, or the aristocratic items) measure a unitary concept, nor is it very likely that the dimensions referred to are in fact unidimensional. An unequivocal test of the relationship between value orientations and attitudes toward tests will have to await the construction of more valid measures of these orientations.

In any event, the questions on value orientation were analyzed in relation to questions on the perceived accuracy of tests, the nature of tested intelligence, the importance of tested intelligence in life, and the items regarding the fairness of the use of tests. No major relationships were found between the respondent's tendency to agree with the value items and their views about the accuracy of tests. Similarly, there were no relationships between values and the perceived importance of tested intelligence. There was one exception: Respondents who agree that "something should be done to keep the feeble minded from having children" (73%) were somewhat more likely to think that tested intelligence matters a lot than respondents who disagree (63%).

There were some relationships between a respondent's view of the nature of tested intelligence and the position he took on the value items (Table 62A, 62B, 62C). If a person feels that "no amount of education or special training can make up for a lack of natural ability," he is more likely to say that tests measure inborn intelligence and is less likely to say that they measure learned knowledge ($p < .01$). If he agrees that "everyone should have the chance to go to college if he wants to," he is somewhat more likely to say that tests measure learned knowledge, although the relationship is not statistically significant.

Let us examine how the person's value system influences his attitudes in regard to the fairness of the use of tests. We have argued that the aristocratically oriented person would be generally against the use of tests, whereas the person favoring intellectual elitism would be in favor of their use. The equalitarian person was hypothesized to take a middle position. If we look at the respondents who agree with the intellectual elitism items, we find that in all instances they are either equally or more in favor of tests (Table 63A, 63B).* The same, however, holds true for two of the equalitarian items (Items I and K) and one of the aristocratic items (Item C; Tables 64A, 64B, 65A, 65B). Three of the equalitarian items go in the opposite direction (Items D, F and H), i.e., respondents who subscribe to these equalitarian values are less likely to be in favor of the use of tests. The second aristocratic item (Item G) does not discriminate at all. Thus, our expectations in regard to the intellectual elitism items tend to be confirmed. The findings in regard to the equalitarian items are ambiguous. If we accept the validity of the five items, we must conclude that equalitarian orientation does not result in a consistent attitude toward the fairness of the use of tests. However, before we can hail this finding as a confirmation of our predictions we must seriously consider the possibility that our a priori classification of these items was in error, and they do not measure an equalitarian attitude. Item I ("If all of us were given an equal chance, we would all be equally intelligent") implies that we are not all equal. The equalitarian person may hesitate to agree with this item not because of what it says but because of what it implies. Note that only 20% of the respondents agreed with this item (Table 25). Similarly, item K ("The less intelligent child needs more help from parents than the very intelligent one") asks for differential treatment rather than for equal treatment of the child and, furthermore, presupposes a difference among children. One could argue that this item runs counter to the orientation of the equalitarian person.

---

*For the sake of this comparison, we have arbitrarily considered a difference between respondents of less than 5% as "no difference." This corresponds approximately to a significance not exceeding $p < .02$, depending, of course, on the respective frequencies involved.

Summary

The following attitude dimensions were used as independent variables: perceived accuracy of intelligence tests, the nature of tested intelligence, the importance of tested intelligence, the fairness of the use of tests and perceived sources of intelligence estimates. Each of these variables was run against one or more of the measures of attitudes toward tests (the dependent variable) to discover possible relationships. We shall summarize only significant findings.

Accuracy of intelligence tests. Respondents who think that tests are accurate tend to be better informed about test results. They are more likely to see their lives as having been affected by tests. They are also more likely to approve of the use of tests than are respondents who think that tests are inaccurate.

The nature of tested intelligence. No significant findings were discovered.

Importance of tested intelligence. Respondents who feel that tested intelligence is important are more likely to have a good idea about their test results and tend to see themselves as somewhat more affected by tests than those who think that tested intelligence is not important in life. Respondents who see tested intelligence as mattering a great deal are also more likely to favor the use of tests.

Fairness of test use. No significant findings were discovered.

Sources of intelligence estimates. Respondents who base their intelligence estimates on school grades are least likely to approve of the use of tests. On the other hand, respondents who base their intelligence estimates on test results were most likely to favor tests.

An attempt was made to relate the respondents' attitudes toward tests to their value orientations. In general, the findings did not reveal any major trends. There was some support for the hypothesis that respondents holding an intellectual elitism view favor the use of tests. However, related findings in regard to the equalitarian and aristocratic items were ambiguous.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

This report is based on one of several studies being carried out by Russell Sage Foundation on the social consequences of standardized ability testing. It presents data on the experience and attitudes of American adults concerning standardized intelligence tests. The subjects used in this study were representative of the non-institutionalized population of the United States, 21 years of age or older. The National Opinion Research Center, in charge of the field operation, conducted the 1482 interviews. The areas investigated were (1) the respondents' experience with intelligence tests, (2) their perceptions and attitudes about intelligence and intelligence testing, and (3) their orientation toward certain aspects of societal organizations. Response frequencies to each of the questions were presented and then analyzed for the effects of social structural and social class variables, attitudes about ability tests and orientations toward society. A special section deals with the effects of religious differences.

Fifty-nine per cent of the respondents reported at least one or more test-taking experiences. This suggests that 41% of the adult population have never taken a test of their "aptitude, IQ, or intelligence." The reported test-taking experience of the respondents' children was about the same as that of the parents. Respondents claimed to be relatively well-informed about their test-results. However, intelligence tests were reported to play only a minor part in the person's estimate of his intelligence. "Success in work" was most frequently mentioned as the primary source. Positive consequences of test results were acknowledged in a number of areas, but negative consequences were rarely mentioned. Tests were seen to measure mostly learned knowledge and they were generally judged to be accurate. Respondents differed in regard to their approval of the use of tests, depending on the context of intended use. For example, the majority of respondents approved the use of tests to decide which children should be put into special classes in school; on the other hand, a majority was opposed to the use of tests to decide who should be allowed to vote.

The following summarized results of cross-tabulations are statistically significant unless otherwise noted. Analyzing the response frequencies by social structural and social class variables revealed the following results:

Sex and Age Factors

The male respondent is more likely to have taken a test than the female and he is also likely to have taken tests in more contexts, e.g., on the job, in military service, and so forth.

The male respondent is likely to be better informed about his test performance than the female.

Asked to compare themselves with others, the female, in contrast to the male, reports a larger number of others to whom she feels inferior.

Both male and female respondents use success in work as the primary source for estimating their intelligence, but the female is more likely to use school grades than the male.

Men are likely to see tested intelligence as reflecting what is learned; women are more likely to stress the importance of innate factors in intelligence.

The younger respondent has more test experience than the older respondent.

He is more likely to rely on grades as a source of his intelligence estimate.

He is more likely to say that intelligence tests measure what is learned rather than what is inborn.

Race

The white respondent is likely to have greater test experience than the Negro.

There were no apparent race differences in the degree to which respondents received feedback of test results, nor in the intelligence comparisons made.

The white respondent is more likely to use performance criteria as the source of his intelligence estimate; the Negro prefers to use significant others, such as parents' and teachers' estimates.

The white respondent is more likely to see intelligence tests measuring what is learned; the Negro is more likely to feel that they measure inborn intelligence.

Social Class

The effects of social class were strong and consistent:

A member of the lower class is less likely to have taken a test and his experience tends to be limited to fewer contexts.

He is less likely to be told much about his children's test results.

He estimates his intelligence as inferior to others.

He relies on significant others rather than on success in work as sources for estimating his intelligence.

The lower class respondent is more likely to see intelligence tests measuring inborn intelligence.

The findings are more complicated when we examine the items pertaining to the fairness of using tests. For some contexts (e.g., "special classes"), the upper class respondent is more likely to favor the use of tests than the lower class respondent. For other contexts (e.g., "job promotion") the situation is reversed. We have no plausible explanation for these differences at this time.

The data were also analyzed in terms of the respondents' attitudes toward tests. The relatively few results which turned out to be statistically significant are listed below:

Attitudes

Respondents who think that tests are accurate tend to be better informed about test results and are more likely to approve of the use of tests than those who think tests are inaccurate.

Respondents who feel that tested intelligence is important in life, in contrast to those who do not, are more likely to have a good idea about their test results and see themselves as somewhat more affected by tests.

They are also more likely to favor the use of tests for selection purposes.

> Respondents who base their intelligence estimates on school grades are least likely to approve of the use of tests. Those who base their intelligence estimates on test results are most likely to favor the use of tests.

As we have pointed out in the introduction, this is a technical report which is limited in its purposes. We have restricted ourselves to the presentation of data either as frequency distributions or in terms of cross-tabulations. Analyses in greater depth dealing with topics of special interest will follow in subsequent reports. Further evaluations and implications of the data presented here will be taken up at that time.

APPENDIX A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY RESEARCH SERVICE
National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago

SRS-100
1/63

ENTER TIME
INTERVIEW
BEGAN:

BEGIN DECK 01

____
(1-4)

(CODE SEX OF RESPONDENT)

Male	6- 1
Female . . .	2

First, we have a few background questions.

1. What do you usually do--work full-time, work part-time, keep house, or something else?

Work full-time	7- 1
Work part-time	2
Unemployed	3
Laid off, or on strike	4
Retired	5
Housewife	6
Other (SPECIFY) ______________	7

*IF HOUSEWIFE OR OTHER:

A. Did you ever work for as long as a year?

Yes	8- 1	(CONTINUE WITH Q. 2
No	2	(SKIP TO Q. 3)

---

2. What kind of work (do you) (did you normally) do?

Occupation: ______________________________
(PROBE, IF VAGUE) What do you actually do on that job?

Industry: ______________________________

____
(9-13)

---

3. What is the last grade you completed in school?

0-6 years	14- 1
7-9 years	2
10-11 years	3
12 years (high school graduate) . .	4
13-15 years (some college)	5
16 years (college graduate)	6
17 or more years (graduate work) . .	7

*IF GRADUATE WORK:

A. Did you receive a graduate degree?

Yes	15- 1
No	2

4. What kind of work did your father do when you were about 16 years old?

Occupation: ____________________

Industry: ____________________

________ (16-20)

---

5. What was the last grade he completed in school?

0-6 years	21- 1
7-9 years	2
10-11 years	3
12 years (high school graduate)	4
13-15 years (some college) . .	5
16 years (college graduate) . .	6
17 or more years (graduate work)	7*

***IF GRADUATE WORK:** A. Did he receive a graduate degree?

Yes	22- 1
No	2

---

6. What is your marital status? (CIRCLE ONE CODE IN ONE OF THE COLUMNS BELOW)

MALE RESPONDENT			**FEMALE RESPONDENT**		
Single, Never married .	23- 1	SKIP TO Q. 12	Single, Never married	6	SKIP TO Q. 12
Currently married . . .	2		Currently married .	7	GO ON TO Q. 7
Separated, divorced . .	3		Separated, divorced .	8	SKIP TO Q. 8
Widowed	4		Widowed	9	SKIP TO Q. 8

---

7. (FOR CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMEN) What does your husband do--work full-time, work part-time, is he laid off, or something else?

Works full-time	24- 1
Works part-time	2
Unemployed	3
Laid off, or on strike	4
Retired	5
Other (SPECIFY) ____________	6

---

8. What kind of work (does your husband) (did your husband normally) do?

Occupation: ____________________

Industry: ____________________

________ (25-29)

9. What is the last grade he completed in school?

0-6 years	30- 1
7-9 years	2
10-11 years	3
12 years (high school graduate) .	4
13-15 years (some college)	5
16 years (college graduate) . . .	6
17 or more years (graduate work) .	7*

*IF GRADUATE WORK:

A. Did he receive a graduate degree?

Yes	31- 1
No	2

---

10. What kind of work did your father-in-law do when your husband was about 16 years old?

Occupation: ____

Industry: ____ (32-36)

---

11. What was the last grade your father-in-law completed in school?

0-6 years	37- 1
7-9 years	2
10-11 years	3
12 years (high school graduate) .	4
13-15 years (some college) . . .	5
16 years (college graduate) . . .	6
17 or more years (graduate work).	7*

*IF GRADUATE WORK:

A. Did he receive a graduate degree?

Yes	38- 1
No	2

BEGIN DECK 02

____
(1-4)

12. Have you ever taken any tests of your aptitudes, or IQ, or intelligence, in... (READ EACH ITEM BELOW)

			Yes	No	Don't know or don't remember
A.	In elementary (grade) school?	6-	1	2	3
B.	In junior high or high school?	7-	1	2	3
C.	In connection with college admission? . .	8-	1	2	3
D.	Graduate or professional school admissions?	9-	1	2	3
E.	In applying for a job?	10-	1	2	3
F.	On the job, in connection with your work?	11-	1	2	3
G.	In connection with military service? . .	12-	1	2	3
H.	In a private testing service or with a psychologist?	13-	1	2	3
I.	In some other circumstance?	14-	1	2	3

--IF "NO" TO ALL ABOVE, SKIP TO Q. 15.

--IF ONE TEST MENTIONED, ASK (1).

--IF MORE THAN ONE TEST MENTIONED, ASK (2).

(1) You mentioned that you've taken a test in connection with (CIRCUMSTANCE REPORTED ABOVE). What was the test like?

15-

(2) You mentioned that you've taken a test in connection with (CIRCUMSTANCES REPORTED ABOVE). Which of these was most important to you?

--ENTER LETTER FROM ABOVE AND ASK (3) BELOW. 16-________

--ENTER "0" IF NONE WAS IMPORTANT OR DK AND ASK (4) BELOW.

(3) What was that test like?

17-

(4) What were the tests like?

18-

13. Think for a moment of the intelligence, IQ or aptitude test(s) you have taken. How clear or definite an idea did you get about your intelligence, from the test(s) you took? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD A)

(IF RESPONDENT CAN'T ANSWER FOR ALL TESTS IN GENERAL, TELL HIM TO ANSWER FOR THE ONE MOST IMPORTANT TO HIM)

I got a very good idea of where I stood compared to others	19- 1
I got a pretty good idea of where I stood	2
I got only a general idea of where I stood	3
I didn't learn anything at all about where I stood because the results didn't mean anything to me	4
I didn't learn anything at all about where I stood because the test(s) were inaccurate	5
I didn't learn anything at all because I was never given any information about how well I did	6

---

14. Now think of all the intelligence, IQ, or aptitude tests you have taken. Do you think any of these things happened to you partly as a result of taking these tests? First... (READ ITEMS BELOW) (CHECK "DOES NOT APPLY" ONLY IF ABSOLUTELY CERTAIN OF THIS)

			Yes	Maybe	No	Don't know	Does not apply
A.	Being placed in a special advanced group in grade school or high school? .	20-	1	2	3	4	5
B.	Being placed in a special slow group in grade or high school?	21-	1	2	3	4	5
C.	Being skipped a grade?	22-	1	2	3	4	5
D.	Being held back a grade--do you think that ever happened to you partly as a result of taking intelligence or aptitude tests?	23-	1	2	3	4	5
E.	Not being admitted to college?	24-	1	2	3	4	5
F.	Being admitted to college?	25-	1	2	3	4	5
G.	Deciding not to go to college?	26-	1	2	3	4	5
H.	Deciding to go to college?	27-	1	2	3	4	5
I.	Deciding to apply to a better college--did you ever do that as a result of taking an intelligence or aptitude test?	28-	1	2	3	4	5
J.	Deciding not to apply to a better college?	29-	1	2	3	4	5
K.	Winning a scholarship or fellowship? .	30-	1	2	3	4	5
L.	Not winning a scholarship or fellowship?	31-	1	2	3	4	5

(CONTINUE Q. 14 ON NEXT PAGE)

14. (Continued)

			Yes	Maybe	No	Don't know	Does not apply
M.	Being given a good assignment or job in the military service--do you think this ever happened partly as a result of your taking an intelligence or aptitude test?	32-	1	2	3	4	5
N.	Being kept from a good assignment or job in the military service?	33-	1	2	3	4	5
O.	Not being hired for a job?	34-	1	2	3	4	5
P.	Being hired for a job?	35-	1	2	3	4	5
Q.	Being promoted on a job--do you think this ever happened partly as a result of your taking an intelligence or aptitude test?	36-	1	2	3	4	5
R.	Not being promoted on a job?	37-	1	2	3	4	5
S.	Deciding not to try for a better job? .	38-	1	2	3	4	5
T.	Deciding to try for a better job? . . .	39-	1	2	3	4	5

---

15. Everybody has some idea of how intelligent he or she is. People get this idea in different ways. Here are some ways people decide how intelligent they are. (HAND CARD B TO RESPONDENT)

(CARD B CONTAINS THE FOLLOWING 11 ITEMS. IF NECESSARY, READ THEM TO RESPONDENT)

1. School grades
2. Your parent's views about your intelligence
3. Your teachers' views about your intelligence
4. Success in your work
5. Intelligence, IQ, or aptitude test scores
6. Your family background
7. Extent of your own education
8. Your children's intelligence
9. Your spouse's views about your intelligence
10. Your friends' views about your intelligence
11. How you compare with other people you know

A. Pick the three things from that card that have had the most effect on you in deciding how intelligent you are. (ENTER NUMBERS BELOW)

________ ________ ________

B. Which of those three was most important? 40- ________ Most important

C. Which of those was next most important? 41- ________ Next most important

D. And which was third most important? 42- ________ Third most

IF RESPONDENT IS SINGLE (NEVER MARRIED), SKIP TO Q. 18

16. We'd like to know the age and sex of your children, starting with the oldest. How old is the (oldest) (next one)?

	Age	Sex		Age	Sex	
1.			6.			
2.			7.			
3.			8.			43-
4.			9.			44-
5.			10.			45-

No children . . . . . . 0 SKIP TO Q. 18

---

17. Have any of your children ever taken an intelligence, IQ or aptitude test, for example, in school, in military service, or at work? (IF YES: How often?)

Yes, several times . . . . 46- 1* ASK A AND B
Yes, at least once . . . . 2* ASK A AND B
I don't know 3
No, I don't think so 4
Definitely no 5

*IF YES:

A. Did you or your (husband) (wife) ever personally arrange to have any of these tests given?

Yes 47- 1
No 2
I don't remember 3

B. Did you ever receive any information about how well your children did on any of the intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests they took? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD C)

(IF RECEIVED INFORMATION ON MORE THAN ONE CHILD ANSWER "IN GENERAL")

I got a very good idea of where they stood compared to others 48- 1
I got a pretty good idea of where they stood . . 2
I got only a general idea of where they stood . 3
I didn't learn anything at all about where they stood because the results didn't mean anything to me 4
I didn't learn anything at all about where they stood because the test(s) were inaccurate . . . 5
I didn't learn anything at all because I was never given any information about how well they did 6

ASK ALL RESPONDENTS:

18. Do you think intelligence, IQ and aptitude tests measure the intelligence a person is born with, or what he has learned? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD D)

Measure only inborn intelligence	49-	1
Measure mostly inborn intelligence, but learning makes some difference		2
Measure inborn intelligence and learning about equally		3
Measure mostly learned knowledge, but inborn intelligence makes some difference		4
Measure only learned knowledge		5

---

19. In general, which of the following best expresses your opinion about the accuracy of intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests? (READ FIRST FOUR CODES)

Tests are very accurate	50-	1
Tests are accurate		2
Tests are inaccurate		3
Tests are very inaccurate		4
Don't know or no opinion		5

---

20. Do you think the kind of intelligence measured by intelligence, IQ and aptitude tests matters much in life? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD E)

Yes, it matters more than anything else	51-	1
It matters a great deal, but no more than other things		2
It doesn't matter as much as other things		3
No, it matters very little		4
I don't know		5

21. Given tests as they are now, do you think it is fair to use intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests to help make the following decisions? First, (READ ITEMS BELOW)

			Yes	No	D.K. or no opinion
A.	To decide who goes to college or who does not? .	52-	1	2	3
B.	To put children into special classes in school--do you think it is fair to use intelligence or aptitude tests to do that?	53-	1	2	3
C.	To find out which children in the family should be given the most education?	54-	1	2	3
D.	To decide who should be hired for a job--do you think it is fair to use aptitude or intelligence tests to decide that?	55-	1	2	3
E.	To decide who should be promoted on a job? . . .	56-	1	2	3
F.	To decide who should be allowed to vote?	57-	1	2	3
G.	To decide whom one should marry--do you think it is fair to use intelligence or aptitude tests to decide that?	58-	1	2	3

---

22. How do you think you compare to other people in intelligence? I am going to name some people and ask you how you compare to them. Beginning with your father, would you say that you are much higher in intelligence, higher, about the same, lower, or much lower? (CODE BELOW FOR EACH)

		I am much higher than	I am higher	The same as	I am lower	I am much lower	Does not apply
Your father?	59-	1	2	3	4	5	6
Your mother?	60-	1	2	3	4	5	6
Your brothers? (in general)	61-	1	2	3	4	5	6
Your sisters? (in general)	62-	1	2	3	4	5	6
Your wife or husband? . . .	63-	1	2	3	4	5	6
Your children? (in general)	64-	1	2	3	4	5	6
Average person in the United States today? . .	65-	1	2	3	4	5	6
People who do the same kind of work?	66-	1	2	3	4	5	6
People you went to high school with?	67-	1	2	3	4	5	6
Most of your friends today?	68-	1	2	3	4	5	6

BEGIN DECK 03

(1-4)

23. Now I am going to read you some opinions people have had. I would like to know in general whether you agree or disagree with each statement--just your general opinion.

			Agree	Disagree	Don't know or no opinion
A.	No amount of education or special training can make up for a lack of natural ability	6-	1	2	3
B.	Children who are intelligent should get better schooling, and not have to stick with the average child . .	7-	1	2	3
C.	People of wealth and position should marry their own kind	8-	1	2	3
D.	Everyone should have the chance to go to college if he wants to . . .	9-	1	2	3
E.	Something should be done to keep the feeble minded from having children	10-	1	2	3
F.	There is no difference in intelligence between racial, religious, or nationality groups	11-	1	2	3
G.	Parents should be allowed to pass on their wealth and prestige to their children, regardless of the children's abilities	12-	1	2	3
H.	A child who is less intelligent rates the same treatment from his teachers as a child who is very bright	13-	1	2	3
I.	If all of us were given an equal chance, we would all be equally intelligent	14-	1	2	3
J.	It is only fair that the people with the most intelligence should have the most opportunities	15-	1	2	3
K.	The less intelligent child needs more help from parents than the very intelligent one	16-	1	2	3
L.	The great things accomplished by man are really the works of just a few great geniuses	17-	1	2	3

38. What is your age?

______ 39-

---

39. What is your religious preference?

Protestant	40- 1
Catholic	2
Jewish	3
Other (SPECIFY)____________	4

---

40. Do you consider yourself a Democrat or Republican?

Democrat	41- 1
Republican	2
Independent	3
Other (SPECIFY)____________	4

---

41. Have you ever had any military service?

Yes	42- 1
No	2

---

42. Did you have any brothers?

Yes	43- 1* ASK A AND B
No	2

*IF YES:

A. How many were older than you?

44- ______

B. How many were younger?

45- ______

43. Did you have any sisters?

Yes . . . . 46- 1* ASK A AND B
No 2

*IF YES:

A. How many were older than you?

47- ____________

B. How many were younger?

48- ____________

---

44. (HAND RESPONDENT WHITE CARD) Adding up the income from all sources, what was your total family income in 1962?

Under $2,000	49- 0
$2,000 to $2,999	1
$3,000 to $3,999	2
$4,000 to $4,999	3
$5,000 to $5,999	4
$6,000 to $6,999	5
$7,000 to $7,999	6
$8,000 to $9,999	7
$10,000 to $14,999	8
$15,000 or over	9
Refused, don't know	X

TIME
INTERVIEW
ENDED

:

45. CODE RACE OF RESPONDENT

White 51-1

Negro 2

Other (SPECIFY)

____________________ . . . 3

NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: PLEASE CLIP OR STAPLE THIS PAGE TO THE INSIDE BACK COVER OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE - IMMEDIATELY AFTER PAGE 22 - AFTER THE INTERVIEW IS COMPLETED.

APPENDIX B

TABLES

TABLE 1

A Classification of Respondents by Social Class Indices: Education, Occupational Prestige and Index of Social Position

(Frequencies and Percentages)

			Combined Categories	
	f	%	f	%
Education				
6 years or less	154	10.4	487	32.9
7 - 9 years	333	22.5		
10 - 11 years	221	14.9	221	14.9
12 years	425	28.7	425	28.7
13 - 15 years	201	13.6	201	13.6
16 - 17 years	86	5.8	145	9.8
17 or more years	59	4.0		
Total*	1479	99.9	1479	99.9
No Response	3	.2	3	.2
Occupational Prestige				
Higher executives, large proprietors, major professionals	38	2.9	38	2.9
Business managers, proprietors of medium businesses, lesser professionals	127	9.5	127	9.5
Administrative personnel, small independent businesses, minor professionals, farmers	127	9.5	127	9.5
Clerical and sales workers, technicians, owners of little businesses, farmers	372	27.9	554	41.6
Skilled manual employees, small farmers	182	13.7		
Machine operators, semi-skilled employees, smaller tenant farmers	278	20.9	486	36.5
Unskilled employees, share-croppers	208	15.6		
Total*	1332	100.0	1332	100.0
No Response	150	10.1	150	10.1
Index of Social Position**				
I	31	2.3		
II	152	11.4		
III	389	29.3		
IV	426	32.1		
V	331	24.9		
Total*	1329	100.0		
No Response	153	10.3		

---

*Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

**Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total. In addition, respondents in the "don't know" category have been excluded.

TABLE 2

A Classification of Respondents by Total Family Income

(Frequencies and Percentages)

Income	f	%
Less than $2,000	182	12.8
$ 2,000 - 3,999	297	20.9
$ 4,000 - 4,999	163	11.5
$ 5,000 - 5,999	170	12.0
$ 6,000 - 6,999	145	10.2
$ 7,000 - 7,999	125	8.8
$ 8,000 - 9,999	157	11.0
$10,000 or more	182	12.8
Total*	1421	100.0
No Response	61	4.1

---

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 3

Frequency and percentage distribution of responses on "total test taking experience" index

Reported Experience in Test Taking Situations	Index Score	f	%
No experience	0	611	41.2
Experience in 1 situation	1	322	21.7
Experience in 2 situations	2	220	14.8
Experience in 3 situations	3	169	11.4
Experience in 4 situations	4	103	7.0
Experience in 5 situations	5	39	2.6
Experience in 6 situations	6	10	.7
Experience in 7 situations	7	7	.5
Experience in 8 situations	8	1	.1
Experience in 9 situations		0	.0
Total		1482	100.1

TABLE 4

Frequencies and percentages of "yes" responses to the question "Have you ever taken any tests of your aptitudes, or IQ, or intelligence, in ..."

Testing Situation	f	%	Total*
In elementary (grade) school	318	21.7	1463
In junior high or high school	471	32.5	1451
In connection with college admission	208	14.6	1421
Graduate or professional school admissions	46	3.3	1383
In applying for a job	365	25.4	1437
On the job, in connection with your work	154	10.8	1429
In connection with military service	327	22.7	1438
In a private testing service or with a psychologist	42	2.9	1439
In some other circumstance	62	4.4	1403

---

* The total number of respondents is less than 1482. The missing cases are respondents who were not asked this question or who did not answer it because the question seemed inappropriate; e.g., it was clear that the respondent had not attended elementary school.

TABLE 5

Frequency and percentage distribution of responses indicating which test situations were most important

Most Important Test Situation	f	%
In elementary (grade) school	15	3.3
In junior high or high school	89	19.4
In connection with college admission	74	16.1
Graduate or professional school admission	15	3.3
In applying for a job	119	25.9
On the job, in connection with your work	30	6.5
In connection with military service	89	19.4
In a private testing service or with a psychologist	14	3.1
In some other circumstance	14	3.1
Total*	459	100.1

---

* 459 respondents (31% of the total sample) answered this question. The balance (69%) represents respondents who did not take more than one test or who did not answer this question.

TABLE 6

Frequency and percentage distribution of the descriptions of tests taken

Kind of Test	f	%
"Intelligence, IQ, Aptitude"	177	11.9
Special aptitude test (music, mechanical aptitude - non math or english - physical in a few cases)	89	6.0
Achievement test - school	89	6.0
Achievement test - other than scholastic; i.e., Civil service, radio, cooking, typing, etc.	103	7.0
Emotional, motivational, "personality" test	15	1.0
Interests, likes, beliefs, etc.	15	1.0
Unclear responses, suggestive of intelligence tests	205	13.8
Uncodeable	89	6.0
Don't know, don't remember	89	6.0
Not applicable (no tests taken)	611	41.2
Total	1482	99.9

TABLE 7

Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "Have any of your children ever taken an intelligence, IQ or aptitude test, for example, in school, in military service, or at work?"

Response Category	f	%
Yes, several times	456	38.0
Yes, at least once	204	17.0
I don't know	132	11.0
No, I don't think so	156	13.0
Definitely no	252	21.0
Total*	1200	100.0

---

* Respondents who have no children or who were coded "non-applicable" were excluded from the total.

TABLE 8

Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "Think for a moment of the intelligence, IQ or aptitude test(s) you have taken. How clear or definite an idea did you get about your intelligence from the test(s) you took?"

Response Category	f	%
I got a very good idea of where I stood as compared to others	220	26.0
I got a pretty good idea of where I stood	210	24.9
I got only a general idea of where I stood	161	19.1
I didn't learn anything at all about where I stood because the results didn't mean anything to me	34	4.0
I didn't learn anything at all about where I stood because the test(s) were inaccurate	0	.0
I didn't learn anything at all because I was never given any information about how well I did	220	26.0
Total*	845	100.0

---

* Respondent who reported having taken no tests (41%) and those who were not asked this question (2%) were excluded from the total.

TABLE 9

Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "Did you ever receive any information about how well your children did on any of the intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests they took?"

Response Category	f	%
I got a very good idea of where they stood compared to others	224	34.4
I got a pretty good idea of where they stood	118	18.1
I got only a general idea of where they stood	73	11.2
I didn't learn anything at all about where they stood because the results didn't mean anything to me	0	.0
I didn't learn anything at all about where they stood because the test(s) were inaccurate	0	.0
I didn't learn anything at all becuase I was never given any information about how well they did	237	36.3
Total*	652	100.0

---

* Total includes only respondents who reported that their children have taken at least one such test.

TABLE 10

Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "How do you think you compare to other people in intelligence? I am going to name some people and ask you how you compare to them. Beginning with your father, would you say that you are much higher in intelligence, higher, about the same, lower, or much lower?"

	Comparison Level											
Item	Much Higher		Higher		Same		Lower		Much Lower		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Your father?	84	6.0	418	30.0	654	46.9	223	16.0	14	1.0	1393	99.9
Your mother?	85	6.0	480	34.0	664	47.0	169	12.0	14	1.0	1412	100.0
Your brothers? (In general)	35	3.1	206	18.3	715	63.5	159	14.1	11	1.0	1126	100.0
Your sisters? (In general)	32	2.8	215	18.8	771	67.6	112	9.8	11	1.0	1141	100.0
Your wife or husband?	27	2.0	227	17.0	746	55.9	307	23.0	27	2.0	1334	99.9
Your children? (In general)	45	4.0	248	22.0	439	39.0	360	32.0	34	3.0	1126	100.0
Average person in the U.S. today?	44	3.0	264	18.0	1041	71.0	103	7.0	15	1.0	1467	100.0
People who do the same kind of work?	41	3.0	372	27.0	937	68.0	28	2.0	0	.0	1378	100.0
People you went to high school with?	34	3.0	274	24.0	776	68.0	57	5.0	0	.0	1141	100.0
Most of your friends today?	15	1.0	161	11.0	1247	85.0	44	3.0	0	.0	1467	100.0

* Excluded are respondents for whom the item is not applicable (e.g., respondents who have no brothers or sisters), or who gave no answer. The latter group is, in all instances, less than 2%.

TABLE 11

Frequency and percentage distributions of "intelligence comparison" indices

	Comparisons			
	"Higher Than Others"		"Lower Than Others"	
Number of Responses	f	%	f	%
0	367	24.8	581	39.2
1	259	17.5	435	29.4
2	301	20.3	276	18.6
3	213	14.4	101	6.8
4	137	9.2	53	3.6
5	94	6.3	22	1.5
6	60	4.0	9	.6
7	34	2.3	4	.3
8	16	1.1	0	.0
9	1	.1	1	.1
10	0	0	0	0
Total	1482	100.0	1482	100.1

TABLE 12

Frequency and percentage distributions of "intelligence comparison" indices (family items)

Number of Responses	Comparisons: "Higher Than Others" f	%	"Lower Than Others" f	%
0	537	36.2	628	42.4
1	316	21.3	455	30.7
2	310	20.9	259	17.5
3	190	12.8	92	6.2
4	78	5.3	34	2.3
5	42	2.8	10	.7
6	9	.6	4	.3
Total	1482	99.9	1482	100.1

TABLE 13

Frequency and percentage distributions of "intelligence comparison" indices (non-family items)

Number of Responses	Comparisons: "Higher Than Others" f	%	"Lower Than Others" f	%
0	822	55.5	1289	87.0
1	331	22.3	150	10.1
2	172	11.6	37	2.5
3	112	7.6	4	.3
4	45	3.0	2	.1
Total	1482	100.0	1482	100.0

TABLE 14

Frequency and percentage distributions of "intelligence comparison" indices (family of orientation only)

	Comparisons			
	"Higher Than Others"		"Lower Than Others"	
Number of Responses	f	%	f	%
0	661	44.6	999	67.4
1	330	22.3	293	19.8
2	312	21.0	135	9.1
3	127	8.6	43	2.9
4	52	3.6	12	0.8
Total	1482	100.1	1482	100.0

TABLE 15

Frequency and percentage distributions of "intelligence comparison" indices (family of procreation only)

	Comparisons			
	"Higher Than Others"		"Lower Than Others"	
Number of Responses	f	%	f	%
0	1024	69.1	894	60.3
1	377	25.4	457	30.8
2	81	5.5	131	8.8
Total	1482	100.0	1482	99.9

TABLE 16A

Frequency and percentage distribution of responses indicating most important source of own intelligence estimate

Most Important Source	f	%
Success in your work	493	33.3
School grades	211	14.2
Extent of your own education	166	11.2
How you compare with other people you know	166	11.2
Your children's intelligence	89	6.0
Your family background	74	5.0
Your teachers' views about your intelligence	74	5.0
Your parent's views about your intelligence	59	4.0
Intelligence, IQ, or aptitude test scores	45	3.0
Your friends' views about your intelligence	45	3.0
Your spouse's views about your intelligence	45	3.0
No answer	15	1.0
Total	1482	99.9

TABLE 16B

Frequency and percentage distribution of responses indicating next most important source of own intelligence estimate

Next Most Important Source	f	%
Success in your work	250	16.9
How you compare with other people you know	237	16.0
School grades	190	12.8
Extent of your own education	163	11.0
Your teachers' views about your intelligence	112	7.6
Your family background	101	6.8
Your children's intelligence	89	6.0
Your friends' views about your intelligence	89	6.0
Intelligence, IQ, or aptitude test scores	74	5.0
Your parent's views about your intelligence	74	5.0
Your spouse's views about your intelligence	74	5.0
No answer	29	2.0
Total	1482	99.9

TABLE 16C

Frequency and percentage distribution of responses indicating third most important source of own intelligence estimate

Third Most Important Source	f	%
How do you compare with other people you know	290	19.6
School grades	216	14.6
Your friends' views about your intelligence	175	11.8
Success in your work	163	11.0
Your teachers' views about your intelligence	119	8.0
Extent of your own education	104	7.0
Your children's intelligence	89	6.0
Your family background	89	6.0
Your spouse's views about your intelligence	74	5.0
Intelligence, IQ, or aptitude test scores	59	4.0
Your parent's views about your intelligence	59	4.0
No answer	45	3.0
Total	1482	100.0

TABLE 17

Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "Now think of all the intelligence, IQ, or aptitude tests you have taken. Do you think any of these things happened to you partly as a result of taking these tests?"

Items	Response Categories									
	Yes		Maybe		No		DK		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Being placed in a special advanced group in grade school or high school	100	14.7	14	2.1	542	79.5	26	3.8	682	100.1
Being placed in a special slow group in grade or high school	13	1.9	0	.0	641	96.1	13	1.9	667	99.9
Being skipped a grade	39	5.7	13	1.9	617	90.5	13	1.9	682	100.0
Being held back a grade--do you think that ever happened to you partly as a result of taking intelligence or aptitude tests	0	.0	0	.0	654	98.1	13	1.9	667	100.0
Not being admitted to college	0	.0	0	.0	489	100.0	0	.0	489	100.0
Being admitted to college	148	30.3	15	3.0	311	63.5	15	3.1	489	99.9
Deciding not to go to college	0	.0	0	.0	489	100.0	0	.0	489	100.0
Deciding to go to college	50	9.6	17	3.3	452	87.1	0	.0	519	100.0
Deciding to apply to a better college--did you ever do that as a result of taking an intelligence or aptitude test	14	3.1	0	.0	445	97.0	0	.0	459	100.1
Deciding not to apply to a better college	0	.0	0	.0	445	100.0	0	.0	445	100.0
Winning a scholarship or fellowship	28	5.6	14	2.8	462	91.7	0	.0	504	100.1
Not winning a scholarship or fellowship	0	.0	0	.0	504	100.0	0	.0	504	100.0
Being given a good assignment or job in the military service--do you think this ever happened partly as a result of your taking an intelligence or aptitude test	173	34.3	31	6.2	285	56.5	15	3.0	504	100.0
Being kept from a good assignment or job in the military service	15	3.1	15	3.1	444	90.7	15	3.1	489	100.0
Not being hired for a job	44	6.1	15	2.1	652	89.8	15	2.1	726	100.1
Being hired for a job	252	34.0	30	4.0	429	57.9	30	4.0	741	99.9
Being promoted on a job	121	17.0	14	2.0	562	79.0	14	2.0	711	100.0
Not being promoted on a job	14	2.0	0	.0	669	96.0	14	2.0	697	100.0
Deciding not to try for a better job	14	2.0	14	2.0	683	96.1	0	.0	711	100.1
Deciding to try for a better job	107	15.0	0	.0	604	85.0	0	.0	711	100.0

---

* Respondents who reported that they had never taken any standardized test were excluded from the total (41%). In addition, many cases were excluded because the items were not applicable, e.g., the respondent had never considered going to college.

TABLE 18

Frequency and percentage distribution of "perceived total influence" index

Number of Perceived Effects	f	%
0	339	38.9
1	224	25.7
2	159	18.3
3	78	9.0
4	33	3.8
5	20	2.3
6	13	1.5
7	1	.1
8	4	.5
Total*	871	100.1

*Respondents who do not report having taken a test (41%) have been excluded.

TABLE 19

Frequency and percentage distribution of "perceived positive influence" index

Number of Perceived Effects	f	%
0	364	41.8
1	228	26.2
2	145	16.6
3	77	8.8
4	28	3.2
5	19	2.2
6	8	.9
7	2	.2
8	0	.0
Total*	871	99.9

TABLE 20

Frequency and percentage distribution of "perceived negative influence" index

Number of Perceived Effects	f	%
0	787	90.4
1	68	7.8
2	10	1.1
3	5	.6
4	1	.1
5	0	.0
6	0	.0
7	0	.0
8	0	.0
Total*	871	100.0

*Respondents who do not report having taken a test (41%) have been excluded.

TABLE 21

Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "Do you think intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests measure the intelligence a person is born with, or what he has learned?"

Response Category	f	%
Measure only inborn intelligence	89	6.0
Measure *mostly inborn* intelligence, but learning makes some difference	308	20.8
Measure inborn intelligence and learning about *equally*	381	25.7
Measure *mostly learned* knowledge, but inborn intelligence makes some difference	470	31.7
Measure *only learned* knowledge	204	13.8
Interviewer should have asked question, but did not	30	2.0
Total	1482	100.0

TABLE 22

Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "In general, which of the following best expresses your opinion about the accuracy of intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests?"

Response Category	f	%
Tests are *very* accurate	178	12.0
Tests are accurate	875	59.0
Tests are inaccurate	207	14.0
Tests are very inaccurate	59	4.0
Don't know or no opinion	163	11.0
Total	1482	100.0

TABLE 23

Frequency and percentage distribution of responses to the question "Do you think the kind of intelligence measured by intelligence, IQ and aptitude tests matters much in life?"

Response category	f	%
Yes, it matters more than anything else	161	11.0
It matters a great deal, but no more than other things	807	55.0
It doesn't matter as much as other things	264	18.0
No, it matters very little	176	12.0
I don't know	59	4.0
Total*	1467	100.0

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 24

Frequency and percentage distributions of responses to the question "Given tests as they are now, do you think it is fair to use intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests to help make the following decisions?"

Decisions	Response Categories							
	Yes		No		D. K. Or No Opinion		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
To decide who goes to college or who does not?	823	55.5	610	41.2	49	3.3	1482	100.0
To put children into special classes in school-do you think it is fair to use intelligence or aptitude tests to do that?	1112	75.0	296	20.0	74	5.0	1482	100.0
To find out which children in the family should be given the most education?	548	37.0	860	58.0	74	5.0	1482	100.0
To decide who should be hired for a job?	860	58.0	548	37.0	74	5.0	1482	100.0
To decide who should be promoted on a job?	688	46.4	746	50.3	48	3.2	1482	99.9
To decide who should be allowed to vote?	178	12.0	1274	86.0	30	2.0	1482	100.0
To decide whom one should marry-do you think it is fair to use intelligence or aptitude tests to decide that?	119	8.0	1318	88.9	45	3.0	1482	99.9

TABLE 25

Frequency and percentage distributions of responses to questions relating to social values

Orientation	Response Categories						Total	
	Agree		Disagree		D.K.			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Intellectual Elitism								
A. No amount of education or special training can make up for a lack of natural ability	762	51.4	672	45.3	48	3.2	1482	99.9
B. Children who are intelligent should get better schooling, and not have to stick with the average child	1022	69.0	430	29.0	30	2.0	1482	100.0
E. Something should be done to keep the feeble minded from having children	963	65.0	371	25.0	148	10.0	1482	100.0
J. It is only fair that the people with the most intelligence should have the most opportunities	390	26.3	1059	71.5	33	2.2	1482	100.0
L. The great things accomplished by man are really the works of just a few great geniuses	460	31.0	948	64.0	74	5.0	1482	100.0
Total	3597	48.5	3480	47.0	333	4.5	7410	100.0

TABLE 25, continued

Frequency and percentage distributions of responses to questions relating to social values

Orientation	Response Categories						Total	
	Agree		Disagree		D.K.			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Equalitarian:								
D. Everyone should have the chance to go to college if he wants to	1337	90.2	130	8.8	15	1.0	1482	100.0
F. There is no difference in intelligence between racial, religious, or nationality groups.	1037	70.0	400	27.0	45	3.0	1482	100.0
H. A child who is less intelligent rates the same treatment from his teachers as a child who is very bright	1230	83.0	237	16.0	15	1.0	1482	100.0
I. If all of us were given an equal chance, we would all be equally intelligent	302	20.4	1149	77.5	31	2.1	1482	100.0
K. The less intelligent child needs more help from parents than the very intelligent one	1210	81.6	256	17.3	16	1.1	1482	100.0
Total	5116	69.0	2172	29.3	122	1.6	7410	99.9
Aristocratic:								
C. People of wealth and position should marry their own kind	427	28.8	982	66.2	73	4.9	1482	99.9
G. Parents should be allowed to pass on their wealth and prestige to their children, regardless of the children's abilities	1076	72.6	346	23.3	60	4.0	1482	99.9
Total	1503	50.7	1328	44.8	133	4.5	2964	100.0

TABLE 26

Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests, by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	Number of Test Situations						Total*	
	None		One or Two		Three or More			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Sex								
Male	244	34.1	280	39.1	192	26.8	716	100.0
Female	367	47.9	262	34.2	137	17.9	766	100.0
Total	611	41.2	542	36.6	329	22.2	1482	100.0
Age								
21-30	56	16.2	151	43.8	138	40.0	345	100.0
31-40	113	29.0	163	42.0	113	29.0	389	100.0
41-50	111	39.7	114	40.7	55	19.6	280	100.0
51-60	131	61.8	65	30.7	16	7.5	212	100.0
61-70	126	79.2	27	17.0	6	3.8	159	100.0
71 years or more	72	78.3	19	20.6	1	1.1	92	100.0
Total	609	41.2	539	36.5	329	22.3	1477	100.0
Race								
White	491	38.6	486	38.2	296	23.2	1273	100.0
Negro	107	57.2	49	26.2	31	16.6	187	100.0
Total	598	41.0	535	36.6	327	22.4	1460	100.0
Religion								
Protestant	458	43.0	383	36.0	224	21.0	1065	100.0
Catholic	132	37.5	139	39.5	81	23.0	352	100.0
Jewish	10	32.3	9	29.0	12	38.7	31	100.0
Total	600	41.4	531	36.7	317	21.9	1448	100.0
Political Preference								
Democrat	349	44.1	290	36.7	152	19.2	791	100.0
Republican	167	40.9	146	35.8	95	23.3	408	100.0
Independent	79	32.6	92	38.0	71	29.4	242	100.0
Total	595	41.3	528	36.6	318	22.1	1441	100.0

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 27

Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience
with standardized tests, by social class indices

Social Class Indices	Number of Test Situations							
	None		One or Two		Three or More		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%
Education								
6 years or less	123	79.9	29	18.8	2	1.3	154	100.0
7-9	234	70.3	90	27.0	9	2.7	333	100.0
10-11	90	40.7	109	49.3	22	10.0	221	100.0
12	103	24.2	205	48.3	117	27.5	425	100.0
13-15	41	20.4	68	33.8	92	45.8	201	100.0
16-17	12	14.0	24	27.9	50	58.1	86	100.0
17 or more years	5	18.5	17	28.8	37	62.7	59	100.0
Total	608	41.1	542	36.6	329	22.2	1479	99.9
Occupational Prestige**								
1	5	13.2	9	23.6	24	63.2	38	100.0
2	30	23.6	46	36.2	51	40.2	127	100.0
3	49	38.6	42	33.1	36	28.3	127	100.0
4	103	27.7	160	43.0	109	29.3	372	100.0
5	56	30.8	95	52.2	31	17.0	182	100.0
6	140	50.4	99	35.6	39	14.0	278	100.0
7	134	64.4	56	26.9	18	8.7	208	100.0
Total	517	38.8	507	38.1	308	23.1	1332	100.0
Index of Social Position***								
I	3	9.6	6	19.3	22	71.1	31	100.0
II	34	22.4	51	33.5	67	44.1	152	100.0
III	91	23.4	166	42.7	132	33.9	389	100.0
IV	165	38.7	192	45.1	69	16.2	426	100.0
V	221	66.8	92	27.8	18	5.4	331	100.0
Total	514	38.7	507	38.1	308	23.2	1329	100.0

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige (Hollingshead, August B. and Redlich, Frederick C., Social Class and Mental Illness. New York: Wiley, 1958.)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 28A

Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests in a school testing situation, by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	Elementary School			Junior High or High School			College Admission			Graduate School Admission		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Sex												
Male	137	19.3	710	205	29.1	705	109	15.7	693	27	4.0	674
Female	181	24.0	753	266	35.7	746	99	13.6	728	19	2.7	709
Total	318	21.7	1463	471	32.5	1451	208	14.6	1421	46	3.3	1383
Age												
21-30	145	42.2	335	213	63.2	337	78	23.9	326	13	4.1	314
31-40	102	26.6	384	158	41.3	383	82	21.8	377	19	5.2	368
41-50	51	18.3	278	68	24.7	275	28	10.3	266	9	3.5	258
51-60	15	7.1	212	22	10.6	209	13	6.3	208	2	1.0	202
61-70	2	1.3	158	6	3.9	154	4	3.2	152	3	2.0	149
71 years or older	0	0.0	91	1	1.1	89	3	3.4	88	0	0.0	88
Total	315	21.6	1458	468	32.3	1447	208	14.7	1417	46	3.3	1379
Race												
White	279	22.2	1254	425	34.0	1249	193	15.7	1226	44	3.7	1194
Negro	36	19.3	187	43	23.9	180	13	7.5	174	1	0.6	170
Total	315	21.9	1441	468	32.8	1429	206	14.7	1400	45	3.3	1364
Religion												
Protestant	210	20.0	1051	328	31.4	1043	146	14.3	1023	31	3.1	996
Catholic	85	24.4	348	119	34.6	344	45	13.5	334	10	3.1	327
Jewish	13	43.3	30	14	34.2	31	9	29.0	31	5	27.2	29
Total	308	21.6	1429	461	32.5	1418	200	14.4	1338	46	3.4	1352
Political Preference												
Democrat	140	18.0	779	227	29.3	776	79	10.5	754	19	2.6	742
Republican	96	23.8	404	138	34.3	402	77	19.3	398	17	4.5	382
Independent	70	29.3	239	91	39.2	232	46	20.0	230	8	3.6	222
Total	306	21.5	1422	456	32.3	1410	202	14.6	1382	44	3.3	1346

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 28B

Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests in an occupational testing situation, by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	Testing Situation					
	Job Application			On the Job		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Sex						
Male	181	26.0	697	98	14.1	694
Female	184	24.9	740	56	7.6	735
Total	365	25.4	1437	154	10.8	1429
Age						
21-30	125	37.7	332	32	9.8	328
31-40	112	29.6	378	38	10.2	374
41-50	76	28.3	269	34	12.7	268
51-60	32	15.2	211	19	9.1	209
61-70	15	5.9	153	18	11.7	155
71 years or older	5	5.6	90	13	14.2	91
Total	365	25.5	1433	154	10.8	1425
Race						
White	323	26.1	1238	139	11.3	1229
Negro	39	21.8	179	14	7.8	179
Total	362	25.5	1417	153	10.9	1408
Religion						
Protestant	247	23.9	1034	102	9.9	1032
Catholic	105	30.9	340	42	12.6	334
Jewish	5	17.2	29	5	17.2	29
Total	357	25.4	1403	149	10.7	1395
Political Preference						
Democrat	195	25.5	765	72	9.5	761
Republican	88	21.9	401	45	11.3	399
Independent	71	30.9	230	33	14.5	228
Total	354	25.4	1396	150	10.8	1388

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 28C

Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests in other types of testing situations, by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	Military Service			Private Testing Service			Other Circumstances		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Sex									
Male	317	44.8	707	32	4.6	699	37	5.5	672
Female	10	1.4	731	10	1.4	740	25	3.4	731
Total	327	22.7	1438	42	2.9	1439	62	4.4	1403
Age									
21-30	101	30.5	331	16	4.8	332	19	5.9	323
31-40	120	31.7	379	16	4.2	378	15	4.2	361
41-50	77	28.4	271	6	2.2	272	11	4.1	268
51-60	20	9.6	209	4	1.9	208	8	4.0	204
61-70	5	3.2	154	0	0.0	155	6	3.9	153
71 years or older	4	4.4	90	0	0.0	90	3	3.3	90
Total	327	22.8	1434	42	2.9	1435	62	4.4	1399
Race									
White	292	23.6	1236	39	3.2	1237	58	4.8	1209
Negro	29	16.0	181	1	0.6	181	4	2.3	175
Total	321	22.7	1417	40	2.8	1418	62	4.5	1384
Religion									
Protestant	240	23.2	1035	27	2.6	1036	40	4.0	1010
Catholic	67	19.8	339	9	2.6	341	15	4.5	330
Jewish	9	30.0	30	3	10.7	28	3	10.3	29
Total	316	22.5	1404	39	2.8	1405	58	4.2	1369
Political Preference									
Democrat	169	22.1	766	21	2.8	764	32	4.3	744
Republican	78	19.5	400	13	3.2	403	13	3.4	388
Independent	75	32.3	232	6	2.6	232	15	6.5	231
Total	322	23.0	1398	40	2.9	1399	60	4.4	1363

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 29A

Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests in a school testing situation, by social class indices

Social Class Indices	Elementary School			Junior High or High School			College Admission			Graduate School Admission		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Education												
6 years or less	2	1.3	153	1	0.7	146	0	0.0	145	0	0.0	145
7-9	20	6.0	332	8	2.5	326	0	0.0	318	1	0.3	317
10-11	41	18.9	217	51	24.1	212	2	9.9	202	2	1.0	198
12	131	31.3	418	218	51.8	421	26	6.3	410	4	1.0	394
13-15	73	36.9	198	104	52.0	200	94	47.5	198	10	5.4	185
16	32	38.1	84	52	61.2	85	51	59.3	86	6	7.3	82
17 or more	19	32.8	58	37	63.8	58	35	59.3	59	23	40.0	59
Total	318	21.8	1460	471	32.5	1448	208	14.7	1418	46	3.3	1380
Occupational Prestige**												
1	11	28.9	38	21	55.3	38	17	44.7	38	9	23.7	38
2	36	29.3	123	63	50.4	125	50	40.0	125	21	17.2	122
3	26	20.8	125	41	32.5	126	37	29.4	126	5	4.2	120
4	121	33.1	366	175	47.6	368	54	15.2	356	6	1.8	339
5	37	20.4	181	37	20.8	178	12	7.0	172	1	0.6	169
6	32	11.7	274	54	20.0	270	12	4.5	264	0	0.0	261
7	30	14.4	208	39	19.2	203	4	2.0	198	1	0.5	196
Total	293	22.3	1315	430	32.9	1308	186	14.5	1279	43	3.5	1245
Index of Social Position***												
I	10	32.3	31	19	61.3	31	15	48.4	31	8	25.8	31
II	46	31.1	148	79	52.7	150	70	46.7	151	25	17.0	147
III	132	34.6	382	197	51.2	385	81	21.6	375	7	19.8	353
IV	71	16.9	421	99	23.7	417	18	4.5	404	2	0.5	398
V	34	10.3	330	36	11.2	322	2	0.6	315	1	0.3	313
Total	293	22.3	1312	430	33.0	1305	186	14.4	1296	43	3.5	1242

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., op.cit.)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 29B

Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests in an occupational testing situation, by social class indices

Social Class Indices	Job Application			On The Job		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Education						
6 years or less	12	8.1	149	13	8.7	149
7-9	46	14.2	325	21	6.4	324
10-11	44	21.5	205	14	6.9	203
12	154	37.1	415	55	13.4	411
13-15	57	34.0	197	27	13.9	195
16	25	29.8	84	16	18.8	85
17 or more	17	28.8	59	8	8.4	59
Total	365	25.5	1434	154	10.8	1426
Occupational Prestige**						
1	13	35.1	37	6	15.8	38
2	27	21.8	124	23	18.4	125
3	28	22.6	124	14	11.2	125
4	141	38.8	361	47	13.2	356
5	47	27.0	174	22	12.6	174
6	64	23.9	268	28	10.6	265
7	30	14.7	204	11	5.4	202
Total	350	27.1	1292	151	11.8	1285
Index of Social Position***						
I	11	35.4	31	4	12.9	31
II	34	23.0	148	28	18.7	150
III	149	39.4	278	51	13.7	373
IV	106	26.0	408	47	11.5	407
V	50	15.4	324	21	6.5	321
Total	350	27.2	1289	151	11.8	1282

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., op.cit.)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 29C

Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests in other types of testing situations, by social class indices

Social Class Indices	Military Service			Private Testing Service			Other Circumstances		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Education									
6 years or less	11	7.4	149	0	0.0	149	3	2.0	148
7-9	39	12.1	323	2	0.6	325	1	0.3	320
10-11	62	29.4	211	4	1.9	209	8	3.9	205
12	109	26.5	412	5	1.2	414	13	3.3	397
13-15	53	26.9	197	16	8.2	196	21	11.0	191
16	36	42.9	84	7	8.3	84	8	9.8	82
17 or more	17	28.8	59	8	13.6	59	8	14.0	57
Total	327	22.8	1435	42	2.9	1436	62	4.4	1400
Occupational Prestige**									
1	20	52.6	38	5	13.5	37	5	14.3	35
2	28	22.6	124	9	7.3	124	13	10.5	124
3	38	30.4	125	3	2.4	125	10	8.1	123
4	63	17.5	369	10	2.7	362	13	3.8	345
5	78	43.8	178	5	2.8	176	7	4.1	170
6	73	27.4	266	4	1.5	266	7	2.7	261
7	21	10.3	204	1	0.5	204	3	1.5	202
Total	321	24.6	1304	37	2.9	1294	58	4.6	1260
Index of Social Position***									
I	15	48.4	31	5	16.1	31	5	17.2	29
II	44	29.5	149	10	6.8	148	14	9.5	147
III	81	21.5	176	13	3.4	379	22	6.1	363
IV	147	35.5	414	8	2.0	410	13	3.3	400
V	34	10.6	321	1	0.3	323	4	1.3	318
Total	321	29.4	1091	37	2.9	1291	58	4.6	1257

---

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., op.cit.)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 30

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who report that their children have taken standardized tests, by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	Response Categories: Took Tests One Or More Times f	%	Never Took Any Tests f	%	Don't Know f	%	Total* f	%
Sex								
Male	274	50.2	194	35.5	78	14.3	546	100.0
Female	385	58.5	218	33.1	55	8.4	658	100.0
Total	659	54.7	412	34.2	133	11.0	1204	99.9
Age								
21-30	31	12.6	210	85.0	6	2.4	247	100.0
31-40	212	62.0	114	33.4	16	4.7	342	100.1
41-50	186	77.5	31	12.9	23	9.6	240	100.0
51-60	124	71.7	20	11.5	29	16.8	173	100.0
61-70	71	56.8	19	15.2	35	28.0	125	100.0
71 or more years	35	47.9	15	20.5	23	31.5	73	99.9
Total	659	54.9	409	34.1	132	11.0	1200	100.0
Race								
White	603	57.6	338	32.2	107	10.2	1048	100.0
Negro	47	34.0	66	47.8	25	18.1	138	99.9
Total	650	54.8	404	34.1	132	11.1	1186	100.0
Political Preference								
Democrat	346	53.6	232	36.0	67	10.4	645	100.0
Republican	190	58.6	98	30.2	36	11.1	1324	99.9
Independent	107	53.8	70	35.2	22	11.1	199	100.1
Total	643	55.1	400	34.2	125	10.7	1168	100.0
Religion								
Protestant	471	54.3	297	34.2	100	11.5	868	100.0
Catholic	157	54.9	104	36.4	25	8.7	286	100.0
Jewish	18	66.7	4	14.8	5	18.5	27	100.0
Total	646	54.7	405	34.3	130	11.0	1181	100.0

* Totals include only parents. Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated.

TABLE 31

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who report that their children have taken standardized tests, by social class indices

Social Class Indices	Response Categories							
	Took Tests One Or More Times		Never Took Any Tests		Don't Know		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Education								
6 years or less	57	44.9	38	30.0	32	25.2	127	100.1
7-9	152	54.1	83	29.5	46	16.4	281	100.0
10-11	90	53.3	65	38.5	14	8.3	169	100.1
12	199	56.2	134	37.8	21	5.9	354	99.9
13-15	89	58.9	48	31.8	14	9.3	151	100.0
16	39	58.2	25	37.3	3	4.5	67	100.0
17 years or more	32	74.4	9	20.9	2	4.7	43	100.0
Total	658	55.2	402	33.7	132	11.1	1192	100.0
Occupational Prestige**								
1	21	70.0	8	26.6	1	3.3	30	99.9
2	65	69.1	21	22.4	8	8.5	94	100.0
3	64	62.8	27	26.4	11	10.8	102	100.0
4	175	57.0	110	35.8	22	7.2	307	100.0
5	73	51.7	51	36.2	17	12.1	141	100.0
6	114	49.3	83	35.9	34	14.7	231	99.9
7	80	47.1	64	37.7	26	15.3	170	100.1
Total	592	55.1	364	33.9	119	11.1	1075	100.1
Index of Social Position***								
I	16	68.0	7	28.0	1	4.0	25	100.0
II	79	68.1	29	25.0	8	6.9	116	100.0
III	182	57.8	111	35.2	22	7.0	315	100.0
IV	179	52.8	120	35.4	40	11.8	339	100.0
V	134	48.2	97	34.9	47	16.9	278	100.0
Total	591	55.1	364	33.9	118	11.0	1073	100.0

* Totals include only parents. Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have also been eliminated.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige. (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., op.cit.)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 32

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who arranged to have their child tested, by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	Response Categories						Total*	
	Yes		No		Don't Remember			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Sex								
Male	20	7.4	248	91.2	4	1.5	272	100.1
Female	29	7.6	355	92.4	0	0.0	384	100.0
Total	49	7.5	603	91.9	4	0.6	656	100.0
Age								
21-30	7	22.6	24	77.4	0	0.0	31	100.0
31-40	17	8.1	193	91.5	1	0.5	211	100.1
41-50	14	7.6	171	92.4	0	0.0	185	100.0
51-60	7	5.6	116	93.5	1	0.8	124	99.9
61-70	3	4.3	66	94.3	1	1.4	70	100.0
71 years or older	1	2.9	33	94.3	1	2.9	35	100.1
Total	49	7.5	603	91.9	4	0.6	656	100.0
Race								
White	44	7.3	553	92.2	3	0.5	600	100.0
Negro	4	8.5	42	89.4	1	2.1	47	100.0
Total	48	7.4	595	92.0	4	0.6	647	100.0
Religion								
Protestant	32	6.8	433	92.5	3	0.6	408	99.9
Catholic	11	7.0	146	93.0	0	0.0	157	100.0
Jewish	3	16.7	15	83.3	0	0.0	18	100.0
Total	46	7.2	594	92.4	3	0.5	643	100.1
Political Preference								
Democrat	25	7.3	316	91.9	3	0.9	344	100.1
Republican	13	6.9	175	92.6	1	0.5	189	100.0
Independent	10	9.3	97	90.7	0	0.0	107	100.0
Total	48	7.5	588	91.9	4	0.6	640	100.0

* Totals include only parents who reported that their children took tests. Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated.

TABLE 33

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who arranged to have their child tested, by social class indices

Social Class Indices	Response Categories							
	Yes		No		Don't Remember		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Education								
6 years or less	0	0.0	57	100.0	0	0.0	57	100.0
7-9	6	4.0	144	95.4	1	0.7	151	100.1
10-11	6	6.7	83	93.3	0	0.0	89	100.0
12	14	7.0	183	92.0	2	1.0	199	100.0
13-15	6	6.8	81	92.0	1	1.1	88	99.9
16	6	15.4	33	84.6	0	0.0	39	100.0
17 years or more	11	34.4	21	65.6	0	0.0	32	100.0
Total	49	7.5	602	91.9	4	0.6	655	100.0
Occupational Prestige**								
1	5	23.8	16	76.2	0	0.0	21	100.0
2	7	10.9	57	89.1	0	0.0	64	100.0
3	6	9.5	55	87.3	2	3.2	63	100.0
4	13	7.4	161	92.0	1	0.6	175	100.0
5	2	2.7	70	95.9	1	1.4	73	100.0
6	9	7.9	105	92.1	0	0.0	114	100.0
7	5	6.3	74	93.7	0	0.0	79	100.0
Total	47	8.0	538	91.3	4	0.7	589	100.0
Index of Social Position***								
I	5	29.4	12	70.6	0	0.0	17	100.0
II	10	12.8	68	87.2	0	0.0	78	100.0
III	15	8.3	163	90.1	3	1.7	181	100.1
IV	9	5.0	169	94.4	1	0.6	179	100.0
V	8	6.0	125	94.0	0	0.0	133	100.0
Total	47	8.0	537	91.3	4	0.7	588	100.0

* Totals include only parents who reported that their children took tests. Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige. (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., op.cit.)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 34

Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question "How clear or definite an idea did you get about your intelligence, from the test(s) you took?" by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	Clarity of Estimate									
	Got a Good Idea		Got a General Idea		Results Were Meaningless		Got No Information		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Sex										
Male	251	54.3	88	19.0	24	5.2	99	21.4	462	99.9
Female	178	45.6	76	19.5	8	2.1	128	32.8	390	100.0
Total	429	50.4	164	19.3	32	3.8	227	26.6	852	100.1
Age										
21-30	144	50.3	60	21.0	11	3.8	71	24.8	286	99.9
31-40	126	46.3	54	19.9	7	2.6	85	31.3	272	100.1
41-50	82	50.6	31	19.1	7	4.3	42	25.9	162	99.9
51-60	46	59.0	12	15.4	5	6.4	15	19.3	78	100.1
61-70	18	56.3	5	15.6	1	3.1	8	25.0	32	100.0
71 or more years	12	63.2	2	10.5	1	5.3	4	21.1	19	100.1
Total	428	50.4	164	19.3	32	3.8	225	26.5	849	100.1
Race										
White	386	50.3	148	19.3	29	3.8	204	26.6	767	100.0
Negro	42	53.8	13	16.7	3	3.8	20	25.6	78	99.9
Total	428	50.7	161	19.1	32	3.8	224	26.5	845	100.1
Religion										
Protestant	290	49.1	111	18.8	21	3.6	169	28.6	591	100.1
Catholic	115	53.0	46	21.2	9	4.1	47	21.7	217	100.0
Jewish	10	47.6	3	14.3	1	4.8	7	33.3	21	100.0
Total	415	50.1	160	19.3	31	3.7	223	26.9	829	100.0
Political Preference										
Democrat	228	52.5	85	19.6	17	3.9	104	24.0	434	100.0
Republican	115	48.5	48	20.3	8	3.4	66	27.8	237	100.0
Independent	77	49.4	29	18.6	7	4.5	43	27.6	156	100.1
Total	420	50.8	162	19.6	32	3.9	213	25.8	827	100.1

* Totals include only respondents who reported having taken tests. Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have also been eliminated.

TABLE 35

Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question "How clear or definite an idea did you get about your intelligence, from the test(s) you took?" by social class indices

Social Class Indices	Clarity of Estimate								Total*	
	Got a Good Idea		Got a General Idea		Results Were Meaningless		Got No Information			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Education										
6 years or less	16	53.3	4	13.3	1	3.3	9	30.0	30	99.9
7-9	46	46.9	11	11.2	8	8.2	33	33.7	98	100.0
10-11	63	49.6	18	14.2	5	3.9	41	32.3	127	100.0
12	151	47.9	68	21.6	8	2.5	88	27.9	315	99.9
13-15	90	58.1	38	24.5	4	2.6	23	14.8	155	100.0
16-17	37	50.7	12	16.4	4	5.5	20	27.4	73	100.0
17 or more years	26	48.1	13	24.1	2	3.7	13	24.1	54	100.0
Total	429	50.4	164	19.3	32	3.8	227	26.6	852	100.1
Occupational Prestige**										
1	20	60.6	6	18.2	0	0.0	7	21.2	33	100.0
2	46	47.9	22	22.9	7	7.3	21	21.9	96	100.0
3	46	60.5	12	15.8	4	5.3	14	18.4	76	100.0
4	122	46.7	53	20.3	11	4.2	75	28.7	261	99.9
5	75	60.5	24	19.4	2	1.6	23	18.5	124	100.0
6	63	46.3	21	15.4	4	2.9	48	35.3	136	99.9
7	34	47.9	13	18.3	2	2.8	22	31.0	71	100.0
Total	406	50.9	151	18.9	30	3.8	210	26.4	797	100.0
Index of Social Position***										
I	17	60.7	5	17.9	0	0.0	6	21.4	28	100.0
II	61	52.1	24	20.5	7	6.0	25	21.4	117	100.0
III	144	50.0	60	20.8	10	3.5	74	25.7	288	100.0
IV	138	53.5	45	17.4	10	3.9	65	25.2	258	100.0
V	46	43.4	17	16.0	3	2.9	40	37.7	106	100.0
Total	406	50.9	151	18.9	30	3.8	210	26.3	797	99.9

* Totals include only respondents who reported having taken tests. Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have also been eliminated.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), a high score an occupation of low prestige. (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., op.cit.)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 36

Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question "Did you ever receive any information about how well your children did on any of the intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests they took?" by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	Clarity of Estimate									
	Got a Good Idea		Got a General Idea		Results Were Meaningless		Got No Information		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Sex										
Male	140	51.3	30	11.0	3	1.1	100	36.6	273	100.0
Female	196	51.6	41	10.8	4	1.1	139	36.6	380	100.1
Total	336	51.5	71	10.9	7	1.1	239	36.6	653	100.1
Age										
21-30	19	61.3	4	12.9	0	0.0	8	25.8	31	100.0
31-40	104	48.6	29	13.6	4	1.9	77	36.0	214	100.1
41-50	100	54.3	20	10.9	0	0.0	64	34.8	184	100.0
51-60	68	54.8	11	8.9	1	0.8	44	35.5	124	100.0
61-70	27	38.5	8	11.4	1	1.4	34	48.6	70	99.9
71 or more years	18	52.9	2	5.9	1	2.9	13	38.2	34	99.9
Total	336	51.1	74	11.3	7	1.1	240	36.5	657	100.0
Race										
White	317	52.9	66	11.0	7	1.2	209	34.9	599	100.0
Negro	17	37.0	4	8.7	0	0.0	25	54.4	46	100.1
Total	334	51.8	70	10.9	7	1.1	234	36.3	645	100.1
Religion										
Protestant	226	48.5	56	12.0	4	0.9	180	38.6	466	100.0
Catholic	90	57.7	11	7.1	2	1.3	53	34.0	156	100.1
Jewish	10	55.6	3	16.7	1	5.6	4	22.2	18	100.1
Total	326	50.9	70	10.9	7	1.1	237	37.0	640	99.9
Political Preference										
Democrat	178	52.2	30	8.8	4	1.2	129	37.8	341	100.0
Republican	96	50.5	29	15.3	1	0.5	64	33.7	190	100.0
Independent	54	50.9	9	8.5	2	1.9	41	38.7	206	100.0
Total	328	51.5	68	10.7	7	1.1	234	36.7	637	100.0

* Totals include only parents who reported that their children took tests. Respondents for whom relevant

TABLE 37

Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question "Did you ever receive any information about how well your children did on any of the intelligence, IQ or aptitude tests they took?" by social class indices

Social Class Indices	Clarity of Estimate								Total*	
	Got a Good Idea		Got a General Idea		Results Were Meaningless		Got No Information			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Education										
6 years or less	21	36.8	7	12.3	1	1.8	28	49.1	57	100.0
7-9	62	41.9	13	8.8	1	0.7	72	48.6	148	100.0
10-11	49	54.4	6	6.7	2	2.2	33	36.7	90	100.0
12	98	49.7	26	13.2	1	0.5	72	36.5	197	99.9
13-15	55	61.8	12	13.5	0	0.0	22	24.7	89	100.0
16	25	64.1	5	12.8	1	2.6	8	20.5	39	100.0
17 or more years	25	78.1	2	6.2	1	3.1	4	12.5	32	99.9
Total	335	51.4	71	10.9	7	1.1	239	36.7	652	100.1
Occupational Prestige**										
1	16	76.2	2	9.5	0	0.0	3	14.3	21	100.0
2	44	67.7	3	4.6	1	1.5	17	26.2	65	100.0
3	33	52.4	9	14.3	1	1.6	20	31.7	63	100.0
4	94	54.0	20	11.5	2	1.1	58	33.3	174	99.9
5	37	50.7	5	6.8	0	0.0	31	42.5	73	100.0
6	53	46.5	15	13.2	0	0.0	46	40.4	114	100.1
7	27	34.6	10	12.8	1	1.3	40	51.3	78	100.0
Total	304	51.7	64	10.9	5	0.9	215	36.6	588	100.1
Index of Social Position***										
I	13	76.5	2	11.8	0	0.0	2	11.8	17	100.1
II	52	65.8	6	7.6	1	1.3	20	25.3	79	100.0
III	101	56.1	24	13.3	1	0.6	54	30.0	180	100.0
IV	85	47.5	14	7.8	2	1.1	78	43.6	179	100.0
V	52	39.4	18	13.6	1	0.8	61	46.2	132	100.0
Total	303	51.6	64	10.9	5	0.9	215	36.6	587	100.0

* Totals include only parents who reported that their children took tests. Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige. (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., op.cit.)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position

TABLE 38

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think they are "higher than others" or "lower than others" in intelligence, by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	"Higher Than Others" One or More Comparisons f	"Higher Than Others" One or More Comparisons %	Total* f	"Lower Than Others" One or More Comparisons f	"Lower Than Others" One or More Comparisons %	Total* f
Sex						
Male	549	76.7	716	379	52.9	716
Female	566	73.9	766	522	68.1	766
Total	1115	75.2	1482	901	60.8	1482
Age						
21-30	277	80.3	345	188	54.5	345
31-40	304	78.1	389	241	62.0	389
41-50	214	76.4	280	173	61.8	280
51-60	141	66.5	212	130	61.3	212
61-70	108	67.2	159	110	69.2	159
70 years or more	66	71.7	92	54	58.7	92
Total	1110	75.2	1477	896	60.7	1477
Race						
White	955	75.0	1273	772	60.6	1273
Negro	141	75.4	187	115	61.5	187
Total	1096	75.1	1460	887	60.8	1460
Religion						
Protestant	765	71.8	1065	637	59.8	1065
Catholic	293	83.2	352	232	65.9	352
Jewish	29	93.5	31	16	51.6	31
Total	1087	75.1	1448	885	61.1	1448
Political Preference						
Democrat	580	73.3	791	497	62.8	791
Republican	308	75.5	408	234	57.4	408
Independent	197	81.4	242	147	60.7	242
Total	1085	75.3	1441	878	60.9	1441

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 39

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think they are "higher than others" or "lower than others" in intelligence, by social class indices

Social Class Indices	"Higher Than Others" One or More Comparisons f	"Higher Than Others" One or More Comparisons %	Total* f	"Lower Than Others" One or More Comparisons f	"Lower Than Others" One or More Comparisons %	Total* f
Education						
6 years or less	95	61.7	154	102	66.2	154
7-9	224	67.3	333	241	72.4	333
10-11	166	75.1	221	142	64.3	221
12	329	77.4	425	249	58.6	425
13-15	167	83.1	201	111	55.2	201
16	77	89.5	86	33	38.4	86
17 years or more	57	96.6	59	22	37.3	59
Total	1115	75.4	1479	900	60.9	1479
Occupational Prestige**						
1	33	86.8	38	30	78.9	38
2	116	91.3	127	66	52.0	127
3	102	80.3	127	73	57.5	127
4	283	76.1	372	228	61.3	372
5	142	78.0	182	104	57.1	182
6	200	71.9	278	176	63.3	278
7	145	69.7	208	145	69.7	208
Total	1021	76.7	1332	822	61.7	1332
Index of Social Position***						
I	27	87.1	31	5	16.1	31
II	140	92.1	152	73	48.0	152
III	303	77.9	389	232	59.6	389
IV	321	75.4	426	262	61.5	426
V	230	69.5	331	227	68.6	331
Total	1021	76.8	1329	799	60.1	1329

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige. (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., op.cit.)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 40

Frequencies and percentages of responses indicating most important sources used for estimating own intelligence: performance criteria, by social structural variables*

Social Structural Variables	Sources							
	School Grades		Success in Your Work		Aptitude or I.Q. Test Scores		Education	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Sex								
Male	77	10.9	273	38.6	36	5.1	79	11.2
Female	136	18.0	223	29.6	15	2.0	82	10.8
Total	213	14.6	496	33.9	51	3.5	161	11.0
Age								
21-30	73	21.3	95	27.7	22	6.4	39	11.4
31-40	62	16.1	125	32.4	17	4.4	49	12.7
41-50	30	10.8	108	38.9	8	2.9	36	12.9
51-60	26	12.3	75	35.5	3	1.4	17	8.1
61-70	13	8.3	60	38.2	1	0.6	12	7.6
71 years or more	6	7.2	33	39.8	0	0.0	8	9.6
Total	210	14.4	496	34.0	51	3.5	161	11.0
Race								
White	188	15.0	439	34.9	48	3.8	141	11.2
Negro	22	12.0	50	27.2	3	1.6	17	9.2
Total	210	14.6	489	33.9	51	3.5	158	11.0
Religion								
Protestant	162	15.4	362	34.4	30	2.9	109	10.4
Catholic	43	12.4	114	32.8	17	4.9	48	13.8
Jewish	5	16.7	7	23.3	2	6.7	2	6.7
Total	210	14.7	483	33.8	49	3.4	159	11.1
Political Preference								
Democrat	111	14.2	239	30.6	27	3.5	93	11.9
Republican	59	14.7	152	37.8	12	3.0	41	10.2
Independent	38	15.8	94	39.2	12	5.0	24	10.0
Total	208	14.6	485	34.1	51	3.6	158	11.1

* Totals are listed on continuation of this Table.

TABLE 40, continued

Frequencies and percentages of responses indicating most important sources used for estimating own intelligence: significant others, by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	Sources											
	Parent's and Teachers' Estimates		Family Background		One's Children's Intelligence		One's Spouse's and Friend's Estimates		How One Compares With Others		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Sex												
Male	54	7.6	34	4.8	33	4.7	35	4.9	87	12.3	708	100.1
Female	78	10.3	38	5.0	55	7.3	52	6.9	76	10.1	755	100.0
Total	132	9.0	72	4.9	88	6.0	87	5.9	163	11.1	1463	99.9
Age												
21-30	50	14.6	11	3.2	7	2.0	12	3.5	34	9.9	343	100.0
31-40	31	8.0	11	2.8	18	4.7	20	5.2	53	13.7	386	100.0
41-50	17	6.1	10	3.6	19	6.8	21	7.6	29	10.4	278	100.0
51-60	17	8.1	14	6.6	18	8.5	19	9.0	22	10.4	211	99.9
61-70	11	7.0	15	9.6	13	8.3	12	7.6	20	12.7	157	99.9
71 years or more	6	7.2	11	13.3	12	14.5	2	2.4	5	6.0	83	100.0
Total	132	9.1	72	4.9	87	6.0	86	5.9	163	11.2	1458	100.0
Race												
White	106	8.4	58	4.6	71	5.6	72	5.7	134	10.7	1257	99.9
Negro	26	14.1	14	7.6	14	7.6	15	8.2	23	12.5	184	100.0
Total	132	9.2	72	5.0	85	5.9	87	6.0	157	10.9	1441	100.0
Religion												
Protestant	98	9.3	58	5.5	65	6.2	58	5.5	110	10.5	1052	100.1
Catholic	32	9.2	11	3.2	20	5.7	23	6.6	40	11.5	348	100.1
Jewish	1	3.3	2	6.7	1	3.3	4	13.3	6	20.0	30	100.0
Total	131	9.2	71	5.0	86	6.0	85	5.9	156	10.9	1430	100.0
Political Preference												
Democrat	68	8.7	44	5.6	50	6.4	57	7.3	91	11.7	780	99.9
Republican	37	9.2	17	4.2	25	6.2	15	3.7	44	10.9	402	99.9
Independent	20	8.3	9	3.8	11	4.6	13	5.4	19	7.9	240	100.0
Total	125	8.8	70	4.9	86	6.0	85	6.0	154	10.8	1422	99.9

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 41

Frequencies and percentages of responses indicating most important sources used for estimating own intelligence: performance criteria, by social class indices*

	Sources							
Social Class Indices	School Grades		Success in Your Work		Aptitude or I.Q. Test Scores		Education	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Education								
6 years or less	9	6.0	53	35.1	0	0.0	12	7.9
7-9	39	12.0	108	33.2	4	1.2	26	8.0
10-11	35	16.0	72	32.9	4	1.8	21	9.6
12	77	18.2	145	34.3	16	3.8	49	11.6
13-15	28	14.0	64	32.0	15	7.5	33	16.5
16	11	12.9	34	40.0	5	5.9	13	15.3
17 or more years	14	23.7	20	33.9	7	11.9	7	11.9
Total	213	14.6	496	33.9	51	3.5	161	11.0
Occupational Prestige**								
1	8	21.1	14	36.8	5	13.2	5	13.2
2	22	17.5	49	38.9	9	7.1	14	11.1
3	16	12.7	55	43.7	6	4.8	13	10.3
4	57	15.5	140	38.0	10	2.7	41	11.1
5	16	8.9	80	44.4	3	1.7	21	11.7
6	34	12.5	88	32.2	10	3.7	31	11.4
7	25	12.3	57	27.9	2	1.0	20	9.8
Total	178	13.5	483	36.7	45	3.4	145	11.0
Index of Social Position***								
I	6	19.4	14	45.2	3	9.7	5	16.1
II	26	17.3	58	38.7	13	8.7	16	10.7
III	61	15.7	145	37.3	13	3.3	51	13.1
IV	48	11.5	168	40.1	11	2.6	46	11.0
V	37	11.4	98	30.2	5	1.5	27	8.3
Total	178	13.5	483	36.8	45	3.4	145	11.0

* Totals are listed on continuation of this Table.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige. (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., op.cit.)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 41, continued

Frequencies and percentages of responses indicating most important sources used for estimating own intelligence: significant others, by social class indices

	Sources											
Social Class Indices	Parent's and Teachers' Estimates		Family Background		One's Children's Intelligence		One's Spouse's and Friend's Estimates		How One Compares With Others		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Education												
6 years or less	13	8.6	8	5.3	18	11.9	14	9.3	24	15.9	151	100.0
7-9	33	10.2	22	6.8	30	9.2	26	8.0	37	11.4	325	100.0
10-11	21	9.6	14	6.4	16	7.3	20	9.1	16	7.3	219	100.0
12	31	7.3	12	2.8	17	4.0	21	5.0	55	13.0	423	100.0
13-15	26	13.0	10	5.0	5	2.5	3	1.5	16	8.0	200	100.0
16	6	7.1	3	3.5	2	2.4	2	2.4	9	10.6	85	100.1
17 years or more	2	3.4	3	5.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	10.2	59	100.1
Total	132	9.0	72	4.9	88	6.0	86	5.9	163	11.1	1462	99.9
Occupational Prestige**												
1	0	0.0	2	5.3	1	2.6	0	0.0	3	7.9	38	100.1
2	12	9.5	7	5.6	2	1.6	0	0.0	11	8.7	126	100.0
3	10	7.9	10	7.9	4	3.2	7	5.6	5	4.0	126	100.1
4	28	7.6	8	2.2	19	5.2	24	6.5	41	11.1	368	99.9
5	14	7.8	7	3.9	9	5.0	7	3.9	23	12.8	180	100.1
6	20	7.3	12	4.4	16	5.9	25	9.2	37	13.6	273	100.2
7	30	14.7	13	6.4	23	11.3	12	5.9	22	10.8	204	100.1
Total	114	8.7	59	4.5	74	5.6	75	5.7	142	10.8	1315	99.9
Index of Social Position***												
I	0	0.0	1	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	6.5	31	100.2
II	13	8.7	8	5.3	3	2.0	0	0.0	13	8.7	150	100.1
III	33	8.5	16	4.1	13	3.3	18	4.6	39	10.0	389	99.9
IV	27	6.4	14	3.3	25	6.0	32	7.6	48	11.5	419	100.0
V	41	12.6	20	6.2	33	10.2	24	7.4	40	12.3	325	100.1
Total	114	8.7	59	4.5	74	5.6	74	5.6	142	10.8	1314	99.9

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige. (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., op.cit.)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 42

Frequency and percentage distribution of "perceived total influence" index, by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	Number of Perceived Effects									
	None		One		Two		Three		Four or More		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Sex												
Male	182	38.6	120	25.4	78	16.5	45	9.5	47	10.0	472	100.0
Female	157	39.3	104	26.1	81	20.3	33	8.3	24	6.0	399	100.0
Total	339	38.9	224	25.7	159	18.3	78	9.0	71	8.2	871	100.1
Age												
21-30	111	38.4	78	27.0	51	17.6	25	8.7	24	8.3	289	100.0
31-40	104	37.7	75	27.2	50	18.1	21	7.6	26	9.4	276	100.0
41-50	63	37.3	40	23.7	36	21.3	17	10.1	13	7.7	169	100.1
51-60	42	51.9	15	18.5	11	13.6	9	11.1	4	4.9	81	100.0
61-70	12	36.4	8	24.2	7	21.2	2	6.1	4	12.1	33	100.0
71 years or more	5	25.0	7	35.0	4	20.0	4	20.0	0	0.0	20	100.0
Total	337	38.8	223	25.7	159	18.3	78	9.0	71	8.2	868	100.0
Race												
White	301	38.5	203	26.0	147	18.8	74	9.5	57	7.3	782	100.1
Negro	34	42.5	19	23.7	10	12.5	4	5.0	13	16.3	80	100.0
Total	335	38.9	222	25.7	157	18.2	78	9.0	70	8.1	862	99.9
Religion												
Protestant	244	40.2	161	26.5	107	17.6	46	7.6	49	8.1	607	100.0
Catholic	82	37.3	54	24.5	39	17.7	28	12.7	17	7.7	220	99.9
Jewish	6	28.6	3	14.3	5	23.8	2	9.5	5	23.8	21	100.0
Total	332	39.2	218	25.7	151	17.8	76	9.0	71	8.4	848	100.1
Political Preference												
Democrat	177	40.0	113	25.6	74	16.7	39	8.8	39	8.8	442	99.9
Republican	93	38.6	70	29.0	38	15.8	22	9.1	18	7.5	241	100.0
Independent	58	37.7	35	22.7	43	27.9	15	9.7	3	1.9	154	99.9
Total	328	39.2	218	26.0	155	18.5	76	9.1	60	7.2	837	100.0

* Totals include only respondents who reported having taken tests. Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have also been eliminated.

TABLE 43

Frequency and percentage distribution of "perceived total influence" index, by social class indices

Social Class Indices	Number of Perceived Effects											
	None		One		Two		Three		Four or More		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Education												
6 years or less	13	41.9	11	35.5	4	12.9	3	9.7	0	0.0	31	100.0
7-9	52	52.5	25	25.3	13	13.1	6	6.1	3	3.0	99	100.0
10-11	66	50.4	30	22.9	19	14.5	6	4.6	10	7.6	131	100.0
12	139	43.2	93	28.9	50	15.5	20	6.2	20	6.2	322	100.0
13-15	30	18.7	45	28.1	45	28.1	22	13.7	18	11.3	160	99.9
16	21	28.4	12	16.2	13	17.6	14	18.9	14	18.9	74	100.0
17 years or more	18	33.3	8	14.8	15	27.8	7	13.0	6	11.1	54	100.0
Total	339	38.9	224	25.7	159	18.3	78	9.0	71	8.2	871	100.1
Occupational Prestige**												
1	6	18.2	8	24.2	7	21.2	6	18.2	6	18.2	33	100.0
2	34	35.1	17	17.6	28	28.9	8	8.2	10	10.3	97	100.1
3	23	29.5	15	19.2	21	26.9	8	10.3	11	14.1	78	100.0
4	96	35.7	84	31.2	38	14.1	32	11.9	19	7.1	269	100.0
5	47	37.3	35	27.8	25	19.8	8	6.3	11	8.7	126	99.9
6	66	47.8	28	20.3	23	16.7	12	8.7	9	6.5	138	100.0
7	40	54.1	22	29.7	9	12.2	1	1.4	2	2.7	74	100.1
Total	312	38.3	209	25.6	151	18.5	75	9.2	68	8.3	815	99.9
Index of Social Position***												
I	6	21.4	6	21.4	5	17.9	5	17.9	6	21.4	28	100.0
II	35	29.7	18	15.3	37	31.4	12	10.2	16	13.6	118	100.2
III	104	34.9	88	29.5	47	15.8	35	11.7	24	8.1	298	100.0
IV	105	40.2	69	26.4	50	19.2	17	6.5	20	7.7	261	100.0
V	62	56.4	28	25.5	12	10.9	6	5.5	2	1.8	110	100.1
Total	312	38.3	209	25.6	151	18.5	75	9.2	68	8.3	815	99.9

* Totals include only respondents who reported having taken tests. Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have also been eliminated.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige. (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., op.cit.)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 44

Frequencies and percentages of responses indicating most important sources used for estimating own intelligence: performance criteria, by "perceived total influence" index

Perceived Effects	Sources							
	School Grades		Success in Your Work		Aptitude or I.Q. Test Scores		Education	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
None**	141	15.1	290	31.1	11	1.2	91	9.7
One	36	16.1	75	33.6	10	4.5	26	11.7
Two	21	13.2	67	42.0	13	8.2	20	12.6
Three	7	9.0	32	41.0	9	11.5	14	17.9
Four or more	8	11.3	32	45.1	8	11.3	10	14.1
Total	213	14.6	496	33.9	51	3.5	161	11.0

TABLE 44, continued

Frequencies and percentages of responses indicating most important sources used for estimating own intelligence: significant others, by "perceived total influence" index (Continued)

Perceived Effects	Sources											
	Parents' and Teacher's Estimates		Family Background		One's Children's Intelligence		One's Spouse's and Friend's Estimates		How One Compares With Others		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
None**	90	9.7	56	6.0	71	7.6	69	7.4	113	12.1	932	99.9
One	23	10.3	7	3.1	11	4.9	11	4.9	24	10.8	223	99.9
Two	11	6.9	3	1.9	2	1.3	4	2.5	18	11.3	159	99.9
Three	4	5.1	3	3.8	3	3.8	2	2.6	4	5.1	78	99.9
Four or more	4	5.6	3	4.2	1	1.4	1	1.4	4	5.6	71	100.0
Total	132	9.0	72	4.9	88	6.0	87	5.9	163	11.1	1463	99.9

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

** Of the 932 respondents in this category, 611 reported never having taken an intelligence test and consequently reported no perceived effects.

TABLE 45

Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question about the nature of tested intelligence, by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	Categories							
	Inborn		Equally Inborn/Learned		Learned		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Sex								
Male	188	26.6	161	22.8	357	50.6	706	100.0
Female	210	27.8	218	28.9	326	43.3	754	100.0
Total	398	27.3	379	26.0	683	46.8	1460	100.0
Age								
21-30	77	22.4	79	23.0	188	54.7	344	100.1
31-40	95	24.8	87	22.7	201	52.5	383	100.0
41-50	81	29.3	72	26.1	123	44.6	276	100.0
51-60	68	32.5	64	30.6	77	36.8	209	99.9
61-70	41	26.4	52	33.5	62	40.0	155	99.9
71 years or more	34	38.6	24	27.3	30	34.1	88	100.0
Total	396	27.2	378	26.0	681	46.8	1455	100.0
Race								
White	321	25.6	342	27.2	594	47.2	1257	100.0
Negro	67	37.0	35	19.3	79	43.7	181	100.0
Total	388	27.0	377	26.2	673	46.8	1438	100.0
Religion								
Protestant	281	26.7	283	26.9	488	46.4	1052	100.0
Catholic	98	28.3	82	23.6	167	48.2	345	100.1
Jewish	14	45.1	5	16.1	12	38.7	31	99.9
Total	393	27.5	370	25.9	667	46.6	1430	100.0
Political Preference								
Democrat	223	28.6	184	23.6	373	47.8	780	100.0
Republican	109	27.1	113	28.0	181	44.9	403	100.0
Independent	56	23.7	70	29.7	110	46.7	236	100.1
Total	388	27.3	367	25.9	664	46.8	1419	100.0

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 46

Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question about the nature of tested intelligence, by social class indices

Social Class Indices	Categories						Total*	
	Inborn		Equally Inborn/Learned		Learned			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Education								
6 years or less	53	35.6	35	23.5	61	40.9	149	100.0
7-9	110	33.4	90	27.4	129	39.2	329	100.0
10-11	46	21.1	50	22.9	122	55.9	218	99.9
12	111	26.2	105	24.8	207	49.0	423	100.0
13-15	38	19.2	53	26.8	107	54.0	198	100.0
16	24	28.3	25	29.4	36	42.3	85	100.0
17 years or more	14	25.5	20	36.4	21	38.2	55	100.1
Total	396	27.2	378	25.9	683	46.9	1457	100.0
Occupational Prestige**								
1	10	27.0	8	21.6	19	51.3	37	99.9
2	32	25.6	46	36.8	47	37.6	125	100.0
3	28	22.6	39	31.5	57	46.0	124	100.1
4	95	25.9	92	25.1	179	48.9	366	99.9
5	46	25.4	45	24.9	90	49.8	181	100.1
6	79	28.7	64	23.3	132	48.0	275	100.0
7	65	31.5	48	23.3	93	45.2	206	100.0
Total	355	27.0	342	26.0	617	47.0	1314	100.0
Index of Social Position***								
I	8	26.7	6	20.0	16	53.3	30	100.0
II	34	22.9	54	36.5	60	40.5	148	99.9
III	97	25.2	103	26.8	185	48.0	385	100.0
IV	108	25.7	97	23.9	216	51.3	421	100.0
V	106	32.4	81	24.8	140	42.9	327	100.1
Total	353	26.9	341	26.0	617	47.1	1311	100.0

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige. (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., op.cit.)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 47

Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question about perceived accuracy of tests, by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	Tests are: Accurate f	Accurate %	Inaccurate f	Inaccurate %	Total* f	Total* %
Sex						
Male	501	78.4	138	21.6	639	100.0
Female	546	80.6	131	19.4	677	100.0
Total	1047	79.6	269	20.4	1316	100.0
Age						
21-30	268	82.0	59	18.0	327	100.0
31-40	293	81.2	68	18.8	361	100.0
41-50	188	74.3	65	25.7	253	100.0
51-60	146	82.5	31	17.5	177	100.0
61-70	104	82.5	22	17.5	126	100.0
71 years or more	45	67.2	22	32.8	67	100.0
Total	1044	79.6	267	20.4	1311	100.0
Race						
White	903	79.2	237	20.8	1140	100.0
Negro	129	82.2	28	17.8	157	100.0
Total	1032	79.6	265	20.4	1297	100.0
Religion						
Protestant	766	80.6	184	19.4	950	100.0
Catholic	241	78.0	68	22.0	309	100.0
Jewish	18	66.7	9	33.3	27	100.0
Total	1025	79.7	261	20.3	1286	100.0
Political Preference						
Democrat	578	82.0	127	18.0	705	100.0
Republican	284	77.4	83	22.6	367	100.0
Independent	158	74.5	54	25.5	212	100.0
Total	1020	79.4	264	20.6	1284	100.0

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total. In addition, respondents in the "don't know" category have been excluded.

TABLE 48

Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question about perceived accuracy of tests, by social class indices

Tests are:

Social Class Indices	Accurate		Inaccurate		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Education						
6 years or less	98	86.7	15	13.3	113	100.0
7-9	222	80.1	55	19.9	277	100.0
10-11	153	77.3	45	22.7	198	100.0
12	312	77.8	89	22.2	401	100.0
13-15	148	79.1	39	20.9	187	100.0
16	69	83.1	14	16.9	83	100.0
17 years or more	45	78.9	12	21.1	57	100.0
Total	1047	79.6	269	20.4	1316	100.0
Occupational Prestige**						
1	31	81.6	7	18.5	38	100.0
2	103	84.4	19	15.6	122	100.0
3	92	83.6	18	16.4	110	100.0
4	254	73.6	91	26.4	345	100.0
5	126	76.4	39	23.6	165	100.0
6	193	82.8	40	17.2	233	100.0
7	143	82.2	31	17.8	174	100.0
Total	942	79.4	245	20.6	1187	100.0
Index of Social Position***						
I	27	87.1	4	12.0	31	100.1
II	120	83.3	24	16.7	144	100.0
III	277	76.5	85	23.5	362	100.0
IV	292	77.0	87	23.0	379	100.0
V	226	83.4	45	16.6	271	100.0
Total	942	79.4	245	20.6	1187	100.0

*Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total. In addition, respondents in the "don't know" category have been excluded.

**A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige. (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., *op.cit.*)

***A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 49

Frequencies and percentages of responses to question about the importance of tested intelligence in life, by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	Categories					
	Matters a Lot		Matters Little		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Sex						
Male	465	68.4	215	31.6	680	100.0
Female	507	69.2	226	30.8	733	100.0
Total	972	68.8	441	31.2	1413	100.0
Age						
21-30	214	63.3	124	36.7	338	100.0
31-40	271	72.3	104	27.7	375	100.0
41-50	189	70.5	79	29.5	268	100.0
51-60	143	74.9	48	25.1	191	100.0
61-70	102	68.5	47	31.5	149	100.0
71 years or more	51	58.6	36	41.4	87	100.0
Total	970	68.9	438	31.1	1408	100.0
Race						
White	828	67.8	393	32.2	1221	100.0
Negro	127	74.3	44	25.7	171	100.0
Total	955	68.6	437	31.4	1392	100.0
Religion						
Protestant	721	70.2	306	29.8	1027	100.0
Catholic	213	65.1	114	34.9	327	100.0
Jewish	16	57.1	12	42.9	28	100.0
Total	950	68.7	432	31.3	1382	100.0
Political Preference						
Democrat	544	72.4	207	27.6	751	100.0
Republican	249	63.0	146	37.0	395	100.0
Independent	150	65.2	80	34.8	230	100.0
Total	943	68.5	433	31.5	1376	100.0

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 50

Frequencies and percentages of responses to question about the
importance of tested intelligence in life,
by social class indices

Social Class Indices	Categories				Total*	
	Matters a Lot		Matters Little			
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Education						
6 years or less	94	72.3	36	27.7	130	100.0
7-9	226	72.4	86	27.6	312	100.0
10-11	147	69.3	65	30.7	212	100.0
12	277	66.6	139	33.4	416	100.0
13-15	128	64.7	70	35.3	198	100.0
16	55	64.7	30	35.3	85	100.0
17 years or more	44	74.6	15	25.4	59	100.0
Total	971	68.8	441	31.2	1412	100.0
Occupational Prestige**						
1	25	65.8	13	34.2	38	100.0
2	87	69.1	39	30.9	126	100.0
3	91	71.7	36	28.4	127	100.0
4	221	61.6	138	38.4	359	100.0
5	116	67.8	55	32.2	171	100.0
6	185	72.3	71	27.7	256	100.0
7	149	76.8	45	23.2	194	100.0
Total	874	68.8	397	31.2	1271	100.0
Index of Social Position***						
I	21	67.7	10	32.3	31	100.0
II	101	66.9	50	33.1	151	100.0
III	242	63.7	138	36.3	380	100.0
IV	285	70.4	120	29.6	405	100.0
V	224	73.9	79	26.1	303	100.0
Total	873	68.7	397	31.3	1270	100.0

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., Professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige. (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., *op.cit.*)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 51A

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for educational decisions, by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	Decisions								
	College Entrance			Special Classes			Who Is To Receive Most Education		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Sex									
Male	398	55.7	715	522	73.1	714	267	37.4	713
Female	424	55.6	763	584	76.3	765	284	37.2	763
Total	822	55.6	1478	1106	74.8	1479	551	37.3	1476
Age									
21-30	186	53.9	345	264	76.5	345	111	32.2	345
31-40	219	56.4	387	304	78.4	388	147	38.2	385
41-50	147	52.7	279	198	70.7	280	94	33.7	279
51-60	121	57.3	211	161	76.3	211	94	44.5	211
61-70	96	60.4	159	112	70.9	158	69	43.4	159
71 years or more	49	53.8	91	62	67.4	92	35	38.0	92
Total	818	55.6	1472	1101	74.7	1474	550	37.3	1474
Race									
White	709	55.8	1270	955	75.1	1271	471	37.1	1269
Negro	97	52.2	186	131	70.4	186	69	37.3	185
Total	806	55.4	1456	1086	74.5	1457	540	37.1	1454
Religion									
Protestant	567	53.4	1062	799	75.2	1063	389	36.7	1063
Catholic	216	61.4	352	265	75.3	352	139	39.6	352
Jewish	20	64.5	31	20	64.5	31	11	35.5	31
Total	803	55.6	1445	1084	75.0	1446	539	37.3	1446
Political Preference									
Democrat	438	56.2	788	605	76.6	789	296	37.6	787
Republican	225	55.1	408	295	72.5	407	151	37.0	408
Independent	134	55.6	241	175	72.3	242	86	35.8	240
Total	797	55.5	1437	1075	74.8	1438	533	37.1	1435

*Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 51B

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for occupational decisions and decisions about voting and marrying, by social structural variables

Social Structural Variables	Decisions											
	Job Hiring			Job Promotion			Voting			Marrying		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Sex												
Male	430	60.2	714	344	48.4	710	88	12.4	712	56	7.9	712
Female	427	55.8	765	339	44.4	762	85	11.1	765	68	6.8	765
Total	857	57.9	1479	683	46.4	1472	173	11.7	1477	124	8.4	1477
Age												
21-30	200	58.0	345	140	40.7	344	27	7.8	344	14	4.1	343
31-40	220	56.7	388	170	44.2	385	31	8.0	388	31	8.0	388
41-50	164	58.6	280	127	45.5	279	34	12.1	280	22	7.9	280
51-60	121	57.3	211	112	53.3	210	29	13.7	211	19	9.0	211
61-70	94	59.5	158	85	53.8	158	31	19.6	158	24	16.0	159
71 years or more	55	59.8	92	47	51.1	92	21	12.0	92	13	14.1	92
Total	854	57.9	1474	681	46.4	1468	173	11.7	1473	123	8.4	1473
Race												
White	733	57.7	1271	570	45.0	1267	143	11.3	1269	99	7.8	1269
Negro	114	61.3	186	102	55.7	183	24	12.9	186	19	10.2	186
Total	847	58.1	1457	672	46.3	1450	167	11.5	1455	118	8.1	1455
Religion												
Protestant	644	60.6	1063	500	47.3	1058	122	11.5	1063	96	9.0	1062
Catholic	185	52.6	352	162	46.2	351	43	12.2	352	24	6.8	352
Jewish	12	38.7	31	8	25.8	31	2	6.5	31	0	0.0	31
Total	841	58.2	1446	670	46.5	1440	167	11.5	1446	120	8.3	1445
Political Preference												
Democrat	465	58.9	790	389	49.6	784	82	10.4	788	62	7.9	787
Republican	238	58.5	407	174	42.8	407	61	15.0	407	36	8.8	408
Independent	129	53.5	241	100	41.7	240	26	10.8	241	25	10.4	241
Total	832	57.9	1438	663	46.3	1431	169	11.8	1436	123	8.6	1436

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 52A

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for educational decisions, by social class indices

Social Class Indices	Decisions								
	College Entrance			Special Classes			Who Is To Receive Most Education		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Education									
6 years or less	95	61.7	154	107	69.9	153	68	44.2	154
7-9	198	59.6	332	241	72.4	333	134	40.5	231
10-11	118	53.4	221	162	73.3	221	75	33.9	221
12	213	50.4	423	318	75.0	424	156	36.9	423
13-15	122	60.7	201	160	79.6	201	72	36.0	200
16	45	52.3	86	65	75.6	86	30	34.9	86
17 years or more	31	52.4	59	52	88.1	59	16	27.1	59
Total	822	55.7	1476	1105	74.8	1477	551	40.1	1374
Occupational Prestige**									
1	23	60.5	38	33	86.8	38	18	47.4	38
2	74	58.3	127	103	81.1	127	38	29.9	127
3	74	58.3	127	93	73.2	127	52	40.9	127
4	199	53.6	371	278	74.9	371	135	36.6	369
5	102	56.0	182	129	70.9	182	68	37.4	182
6	164	59.2	277	214	77.3	277	103	38.3	275
7	113	54.3	208	143	69.1	207	79	38.0	208
Total	749	56.3	1330	993	74.7	1329	493	37.2	1326
Index of Social Position***									
I	18	58.1	31	27	87.1	31	13	41.9	31
II	88	57.9	152	122	80.3	152	51	33.6	152
III	206	53.1	388	291	75.0	388	140	36.3	386
IV	239	56.1	426	315	73.4	426	153	35.9	426
V	198	59.8	331	237	71.8	330	136	41.3	329
Total	749	56.4	1328	992	74.8	1327	493	37.2	1324

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige. (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., op.cit.)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 52B

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for occupational decisions and decisions about voting and marrying, by social class indices

Social Class Indices	Decisions											
	Job Hiring			Job Promotion			Voting			Marrying		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Education												
6 years or less	88	57.1	154	93	61.2	152	34	22.1	154	18	11.7	154
7-9	188	56.5	333	175	52.9	331	50	15.1	332	34	10.3	331
10-11	128	58.2	220	101	45.9	220	18	8.2	220	17	7.7	221
12	256	60.2	425	193	45.9	423	30	7.1	424	22	5.2	424
13-15	113	56.5	200	73	36.7	199	27	13.5	200	14	7.0	200
16	52	60.5	86	30	34.9	86	8	9.3	86	7	8.1	86
17 years or more	31	52.5	59	18	30.5	59	6	10.2	59	12	20.3	59
Total	856	58.0	1477	683	46.5	1470	173	11.7	1475	124	8.4	1475
Occupational Prestige**												
1	21	55.3	38	13	34.2	38	5	13.2	38	6	15.8	38
2	69	54.3	127	46	36.2	127	14	11.0	127	15	11.8	127
3	84	66.1	127	61	48.0	127	16	12.6	127	12	9.4	127
4	215	58.0	371	148	40.2	368	35	9.5	370	24	6.5	370
5	109	60.2	181	92	50.9	181	25	13.8	181	13	7.1	181
6	151	54.5	277	143	51.6	277	34	12.3	277	18	6.5	277
7	121	58.2	208	111	54.4	204	23	11.1	207	22	10.7	207
Total	770	57.9	1329	614	46.4	1322	152	11.5	1327	110	8.3	1327
Index of Social Position***												
I	16	51.6	31	10	32.3	31	4	12.9	31	5	16.1	31
II	85	55.9	152	55	36.2	152	16	10.5	152	18	11.8	152
III	232	59.8	388	157	40.7	386	34	8.8	387	22	5.7	387
IV	252	59.8	425	209	49.3	425	51	12.0	425	35	8.2	425
V	184	55.6	331	183	56.0	327	47	14.2	330	30	9.1	330
Total	769	58.0	1327	614	46.5	1321	152	11.5	1325	110	8.3	1325

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

** A low score means an occupation of high prestige (e.g., professionals or executives), and a high score an occupation of low prestige. (Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C., op.cit.)

*** A low score means high social class according to Hollingshead's Index of Social Position.

TABLE 53

Frequency and percentage distributions on Generational Social Mobility indices

	Discrepancy Score*	Individual Categories		Combined Categories	
Education		f	%	f	%
Upward Mobility	4	57	24.8	465	36.6
	3	93	7.3		
	2	315	4.5		
No Mobility	1	236	6.0	763	60.1
	0	451	35.5		
	- 1	76	18.6		
Downward Mobility	- 2	21	0.5	42	3.3
	- 3	15	1.2		
	- 4	6	1.7		
Total		1270	100.1	1270	100.0
No Response		212	14.3	212	14.3
Occupational Prestige					
Upward Mobility	4	7	0.5	133	9.9
	3	29	2.2		
	2	97	7.2		
No Mobility	1	238	17.7	1161	86.3
	0	591	43.9		
	- 1	332	24.7		
Downward Mobility	- 2	26	1.9	51	3.8
	- 3	20	1.5		
	- 4	5	0.4		
Total		1345	100.0	1345	100.0
No Response		137	9.2	137	9.2
Index of Social Position					
Upward Mobility	4	5	0.6	126	14.7
	3	20	2.3		
	2	101	11.8		
No Mobility	1	277	32.3	701	81.7
	0	315	36.7		
	- 1	109	12.7		
Downward Mobility	- 2	23	2.7	31	3.6
	- 3	6	0.7		
	- 4	2	0.2		
Total		858	100.0	858	100.0
No Response		624	42.1	624	42.1

* Discrepancy scores equal respondent's score minus respondent's father's score (adjusted so that a positive score means upward mobility).

TABLE 54

Frequency and percentage distributions on Social Mobility through Marriage indices

	Discrepancy Score*	Individual Categories		Combined Categories	
Education		f	%	f	%
	4	12	2.6		
Upward Mobility	3	10	2.2	54	11.6
	2	32	6.9		
	1	21	4.5		
No Mobility	0	308	66.4	361	77.8
	- 1	32	6.9		
	- 2	28	6.0		
Downward Mobility	- 3	16	3.4	49	10.6
	- 4	5	1.1		
Total		464	100.0	464	100.0
No Response		1018	68.7	1018	68.7
Occupational Prestige					
	4	2	0.3		
Upward Mobility	3	8	1.1	32	4.4
	2	22	3.0		
	1	137	18.9		
No Mobility	0	383	52.9	658	90.9
	- 1	138	19.1		
	- 2	23	3.2		
Downward Mobility	- 3	7	1.0	34	4.7
	- 4	4	0.6		
Total		724	100.1	724	100.0
No Response		758	51.1	758	51.1
Index of Social Position					
	4	0	0.0		
Upward Mobility	3	3	1.1	20	7.5
	2	17	6.4		
	1	52	19.5		
No Mobility	0	114	42.9	223	83.8
	- 1	57	21.4		
	- 2	19	7.1		
Downward Mobility	- 3	2	0.8	23	8.6
	- 4	2	0.8		
Total		266	100.0	266	99.9
No Response		1216	82.1	1216	82.1

*Discrepancy scores equal respondent's father-in-law score minus respondent's father's score (adjusted so that a positive score means upward mobility).

TABLE 55A

Frequencies and percentages of respondents at each level of social class (Education), by social mobility (Generational)

Generational Social Mobility (Education)	Education										Total*	
	"high" 1		2		3		4		"low" 5			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Upward	93	20.0	98	21.1	273	58.8					464	99.9
None	45	5.9	91	11.9	98	12.8	180	23.6	349	45.7	763	99.9
Downward					9	21.4	10	23.8	23	54.8	42	100.0
Total	138	10.9	189	14.9	380	29.9	190	15.0	372	29.3	1269	100.0

TABLE 55B

Frequencies and percentages of respondents at each level of social class (Occupational Prestige), by social mobility (Generational)

Generational Social Mobility (Occupational Prestige)	Occupational Prestige										Total*	
	"high" 1		2		3		4		"low" 5			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Upward	27	20.3	86	64.7	20	15.0					133	100.0
None	11	1.0	41	3.5	103	8.9	549	47.3	456	39.3	1160	100.0
Downward					3	5.9	22	43.1	26	51.0	51	100.0
Total	38	2.8	127	9.4	126	9.4	571	42.5	482	35.9	1344	100.0

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 55C

Frequencies and percentages of respondents at each level of social class (Index of Social Position), by social mobility (Generational)

Generational Social Mobility (Index of Social Position)	Index of Social Position										Total*	
	"high" 1		2		3		4		"low" 5			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Upward	19	15.2	45	36.0	61	48.8					125	100.0
None	10	1.4	68	9.7	207	29.5	258	36.8	158	22.5	701	99.9
Downward					8	25.8	9	29.0	14	45.2	31	100.0
Total	29	3.4	113	13.2	276	32.2	267	31.2	172	20.1	857	100.1

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 56A

Frequencies and percentages of respondents
at each level of social class (Education),
by social mobility (Mobility Through Marriage)

Mobility Through Marriage (Education)	Education "high" 1		2		3		4		"low" 5		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Upward	9	16.7	11	20.4	19	35.2	5	9.3	10	18.5	54	100.1
None	21	5.8	46	12.8	130	36.1	49	13.6	114	31.7	360	100.0
Downward	4	8.2	21	42.9	14	28.6	6	12.2	4	8.2	49	100.1
Total	34	7.3	78	16.8	163	35.2	60	13.0	128	27.6	463	99.9

TABLE 56B

Frequencies and percentages of respondents
at each level of social class (Occupational Prestige),
by social mobility (Mobility Through Marriage)

Mobility Through Marriage (Occupational Prestige)	Occupational Prestige "high" 1		2		3		4		"low" 5		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Upward	1	3.9	4	15.4	4	15.4	12	46.1	5	19.2	26	100.0
None			61	11.0	27	4.9	255	46.2	209	37.9	552	100.0
Downward	2	7.4	7	26.0	2	7.4	11	40.7	5	18.5	27	100.0
Total	3	.5	72	11.9	33	5.5	278	46.0	219	36.2	605	100.1

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 56C

Frequencies and percentages of respondents
at each level of social class (Index of Social
Position), by social mobility (Mobility Through Marriage)

Mobility Through Marriage (Index of Social Position)	Index of Social Position											
	"high" 1		2		3		4		"low" 5		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Upward	1	6.2	3	18.7	9	56.2	2	12.5	1	6.2	16	99.8
None	1	.6	20	11.2	79	44.1	44	24.6	35	19.5	179	100.0
Downward	1	5.3	4	21.0	7	36.8	5	26.3	2	10.5	19	99.9
Total	3	1.4	27	12.6	95	44.4	51	23.8	38	17.8	214	100.0

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 57

Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question "How clear or definite an idea did you get about your intelligence, from the test(s) you took?" by attitude variables: accuracy of tests, nature of tested intelligence, and importance of tested intelligence in life

	Clarity of Estimate									
Attitude Variables:	Got a Good Idea		Got a General Idea		Results Were Meaningless		Got No Information		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Perceived Accuracy of Tests										
Accurate	350	54.8	120	18.8	24	3.8	145	22.7	639	100.1
Inaccurate	64	37.4	39	22.8	8	4.7	60	35.1	171	100.0
Total	414	51.1	159	19.6	32	4.0	205	25.3	810	100.0
Nature of Tested Intelligence										
Inborn	102	51.0	37	18.5	3	1.5	58	29.0	200	100.0
Equally Inborn/Learned	101	47.9	45	21.3	8	3.8	57	27.0	211	100.0
Learned	221	51.3	79	18.3	19	4.4	112	26.0	431	100.0
Total	424	50.4	161	19.1	30	3.6	227	27.0	842	100.0
Importance of Tested Intelligence										
Matters a Lot	308	53.0	119	20.5	17	2.9	137	23.6	581	100.0
Matters Little	114	44.7	43	16.9	15	5.9	83	32.5	255	100.0
Total	422	50.5	162	19.4	32	3.8	220	26.3	836	100.0

* Totals include only respondents who reported having taken tests. Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have also been eliminated.

TABLE 58

Frequency and percentage distributions of "perceived total influence" index, by attitude variables: accuracy of tests, nature of tested intelligence, and importance of tested intelligence in life

Attitude Variables:	Number of Perceived Effects										Total*	
	None		One		Two		Three		Four or More			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Perceived Accuracy of Tests												
Accurate	233	35.9	176	27.1	127	19.6	61	9.4	52	8.0	649	100.0
Inaccurate	81	45.2	40	22.4	24	13.4	16	8.9	18	10.1	179	100.0
Total	314	37.9	216	26.1	151	18.2	77	9.3	70	8.4	828	99.9
Nature of Tested Intelligence												
Inborn	79	38.4	53	25.7	40	19.4	17	8.2	17	8.2	206	99.9
Equally Inborn/Learned	96	44.7	52	24.2	35	16.3	20	9.3	12	5.6	215	100.1
Learned	160	36.4	118	26.9	82	18.7	39	8.9	40	9.1	439	100.0
Total	335	38.9	223	25.9	157	18.3	76	8.8	69	8.0	860	99.9
Importance of Tested Intelligence												
Matters a Lot	212	35.7	165	27.8	113	19.0	50	8.4	54	9.1	594	100.0
Matters Little	114	43.7	58	22.2	46	17.6	27	10.3	16	6.1	261	99.9
Total	326	38.1	223	26.1	159	18.6	77	9.0	70	8.2	855	100.0

* Totals include only respondents who reported having taken tests. Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking and respondents in the "don't know" category have been eliminated.

TABLE 59A

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for educational decisions, by attitude variables: accuracy of tests, nature of tested intelligence, and importance of tested intelligence in life

	Decisions								
Attitude Variables:	College Entrance			Special Classes			Who Is To Receive Most Education		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Perceived Accuracy of Test									
Accurate	624	60.5	1032	832	82.0	1015	408	43.2	945
Inaccurate	110	42.0	262	165	64.5	256	118	28.3	417
Total	734	56.7	1294	997	78.4	1271	526	38.6	1362
Nature of Tested Intelligence									
Inborn	229	60.0	383	298	78.2	381	166	44.0	377
Equally Inborn/Learned	204	56.0	365	282	78.6	359	137	37.7	363
Learned	380	57.2	664	515	79.2	650	245	37.5	654
Total	813	57.6	1412	1095	78.8	1390	548	39.3	1394
Importance of Tested Intelligence									
Matters a Lot	604	63.2	956	772	81.9	943	427	42.1	1015
Matters Little	182	42.9	424	294	70.8	415	67	26.4	254
Total	786	57.0	1380	1066	78.5	1358	494	38.9	1269

* Totals include only respondents who reported having taken tests. Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking and respondents in the "don't know" category have been eliminated.

TABLE 59B

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for occupational decisions and decisions about voting and marrying, by attitude variables: accuracy of tests, nature of tested intelligence, and importance of tested intelligence in life

Attitude Variables:	Decisions											
	Job Hiring			Job Promotion			Voting			Marrying		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Perceived Accuracy of Test												
Accurate	662	65.2	1016	533	52.1	1023	124	12.0	1031	87	8.5	1027
Inaccurate	125	47.9	261	85	32.8	259	35	13.3	264	24	9.3	257
Total	787	61.6	1277	618	48.2	1282	159	12.3	1295	111	8.6	1284
Nature of Tested Intelligence												
Inborn	229	60.7	377	190	49.6	383	50	12.9	388	34	8.9	384
Equally Inborn/Learned	214	59.8	358	162	44.4	365	47	12.6	372	28	7.7	366
Learned	406	61.5	660	325	49.3	659	74	11.1	668	59	8.9	665
Total	849	60.9	1395	677	48.1	1407	171	12.0	1428	121	8.6	1415
Importance of Tested Intelligence												
Matters a Lot	640	67.8	944	527	55.7	946	127	13.3	956	100	10.5	951
Matters Little	197	46.9	420	133	31.2	426	41	9.5	433	18	4.2	429
Total	837	61.4	1364	660	48.1	1372	168	12.1	1389	118	8.6	1380

* Totals include only respondents who reported having taken tests. Respondents for whom relevent information is lacking and respondents in the "don't know" category have been eliminated.

TABLE 60

Frequency and percentage distributions of "perceived total influence" index, by attitude variable: fairness of the use of tests

Perceived Fairness of Decisions:	Number of Perceived Effects											
	None		One		Two		Three		Four or More		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
College Entrance												
Yes	184	38.0	121	25.0	93	19.2	45	9.3	41	8.5	484	100.0
No	149	39.8	97	25.9	65	17.4	33	8.8	30	8.0	374	99.9
Total	333	38.8	218	25.4	158	18.4	78	9.1	71	8.3	858	100.0
Special Classes												
Yes	266	39.5	163	24.2	124	18.4	63	9.3	58	8.6	674	100.0
No	62	36.0	53	30.8	31	18.0	14	8.1	12	7.0	172	99.9
Total	328	38.8	216	25.5	155	18.3	77	9.1	70	8.3	846	100.0
Who Is To Receive Most Education												
Yes	125	39.1	78	24.4	68	21.2	26	8.1	23	7.2	320	100.0
No	203	39.0	137	26.3	90	17.3	48	9.2	43	8.2	521	100.0
Total	328	39.0	215	25.6	158	18.8	74	8.8	66	7.8	841	100.0
Job Hiring												
Yes	204	37.7	143	26.4	95	17.6	51	9.4	48	8.8	541	99.9
No	123	39.9	76	24.7	63	20.4	26	8.4	20	6.5	308	99.9
Total	327	38.5	219	25.8	158	18.6	77	9.1	68	8.0	849	100.0
Job Promotion												
Yes	132	33.7	104	26.5	84	21.4	39	10.0	33	8.4	392	100.0
No	195	42.5	116	25.3	73	15.9	39	8.5	36	7.8	459	100.0
Total	327	38.4	220	25.8	157	18.4	78	9.2	69	8.1	851	99.9
Voting												
Yes	21	25.9	20	24.7	21	25.9	12	14.8	7	8.6	81	99.9
No	313	40.1	203	26.0	136	17.4	65	8.3	63	8.1	780	99.9
Total	334	38.8	223	25.9	157	18.2	77	8.9	70	8.1	861	99.9
Marrying												
Yes	22	35.5	14	22.6	14	22.6	8	12.9	4	6.4	62	100.0
No	312	39.3	206	26.0	139	17.5	70	8.8	66	8.3	793	99.9
Total	334	39.1	220	25.7	153	17.9	78	9.1	70	8.2	855	100.0

* Totals include only respondents who reported having taken tests. Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated.

TABLE 61A

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for educational decisions, by most important sources used for estimating own intelligence

	Decisions								
	College Entrance			Special Classes			Who Is To Receive Most Education		
Sources:	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
School Grades	107	51.7	207	154	75.1	205	66	32.0	206
Success in Your Work	268	55.7	481	366	78.0	469	185	39.2	472
Aptitude and I.Q. Test Scores	33	64.9	51	42	84.0	50	21	42.0	50
Education	95	60.9	156	128	82.6	155	58	38.2	152
Parents' and Teachers' Estimates	70	54.7	128	101	78.3	129	49	38.3	128
Family Background	41	61.2	67	51	79.7	64	25	37.3	67
One's Children's Intelligence	51	60.0	85	66	78.6	84	42	51.2	82
One's Spouse's and Friends' Estimates	49	59.0	83	65	79.3	82	35	42.7	82
How One Compares With Others	100	63.3	158	121	79.1	153	63	40.4	156
Total	814	57.5	1416	1094	78.6	1391	544	39.0	1395

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total. In addition, respondents in the "don't know" category have been excluded.

TABLE 61B

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for occupational decisions and decisions about voting and marrying, by most important sources used for estimating own intelligence

Sources:	Decisions											
	Job Hiring			Job Promotion			Voting			Marrying		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
School Grades	119	57.8	206	87	42.9	203	18	8.6	209	17	8.2	207
Success in Your Work	286	60.2	475	228	47.4	481	65	13.5	483	34	7.1	480
Aptitude and I.Q. Test Scores	37	74.0	50	23	45.1	51	4	8.0	50	3	6.0	50
Education	94	59.9	157	76	48.4	157	13	8.3	157	9	5.8	154
Parents' and Teachers' Estimates	75	62.0	121	61	48.4	126	11	8.5	130	14	10.9	129
Family Background	40	58.0	69	34	48.6	70	11	15.9	69	9	12.9	70
One's Children's Intelligence	50	61.7	81	51	62.2	82	15	17.4	86	10	11.8	85
One's Spouse's and Friends' Estimates	48	59.3	81	43	52.4	82	13	15.3	85	8	9.4	85
How One Compares With Others	99	63.1	157	72	45.9	157	20	12.4	161	20	12.6	159
Total	848	60.7	1397	675	47.9	1409	170	11.9	1430	124	8.7	1419

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total. In addition, respondents in the "don't know" category have been excluded.

TABLE 62A

Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question about the nature of tested intelligence, by social values

	Categories							
	Inborn		Equally Inborn/Learned		Learned		Total*	
Orientation Items:	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Intellectual Elitism								
A. No amount of education or special training can make up for a lack of natural ability								
Agree	224	29.7	212	28.1	318	42.2	754	100.0
Disagree	161	24.4	157	23.8	343	51.9	661	100.0
Total	385	27.2	369	26.1	661	46.7	1415	100.0
B. Children who are intelligent should get better schooling, and not have to stick with the average child.								
Agree	290	28.7	255	25.2	465	46.1	1010	100.0
Disagree	100	23.9	113	27.1	204	49.0	417	100.0
Total	390	27.3	368	25.8	669	46.9	1427	100.0
E. Something should be done to keep the feeble minded from having children								
Agree	268	28.2	245	25.8	438	46.0	951	100.0
Disagree	88	24.0	92	25.1	187	51.0	367	100.1
Total	356	27.0	337	25.6	625	47.4	1318	100.0
J. It is only fair that the people with the most intelligence should have the most opportunities.								
Agree	102	26.9	102	27.0	174	46.1	378	100.0
Disagree	284	27.2	265	25.3	498	47.5	1047	100.0
Total	386	27.1	367	25.8	672	47.2	1425	100.1
L. The great things accomplished by man are really the works of just a few great geniuses.								
Agree	146	32.0	113	24.8	197	43.2	456	100.0
Disagree	230	24.5	249	26.5	460	49.0	939	100.0
Total	376	27.0	362	25.9	657	47.1	1395	100.0

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 62B

Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question about the nature of tested intelligence, by social values

	Categories							
	Inborn		Equally Inborn/Learned		Learned		Total*	
Orientation Items:	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Equalitarian								
D. Everyone should have a chance to go to college if he wants to.								
Agree	361	27.2	332	25.0	634	47.8	1327	100.0
Disagree	34	28.4	41	34.2	45	37.5	120	100.1
Total	395	27.3	373	25.8	679	46.9	1447	100.0
F. There is no difference in intelligence between racial, religious, or nationality groups.								
Agree	294	28.6	250	24.3	484	47.1	1028	100.0
Disagree	90	23.1	111	28.5	188	48.3	389	99.9
Total	384	27.1	361	25.5	672	47.4	1417	100.0
H. A child who is less intelligent rates the same treatment from his teachers as a child who is very bright.								
Agree	336	27.5	328	26.8	558	45.7	1222	100.0
Disagree	60	26.7	47	20.9	118	52.5	225	100.1
Total	396	27.4	375	25.9	676	46.7	1447	100.0
I. If all of us were given an equal chance, we would all be equally intelligent.								
Agree	91	31.1	64	21.8	138	47.1	293	100.0
Disagree	292	25.8	303	26.8	537	47.5	1132	100.1
Total	383	26.9	367	25.8	675	47.4	1425	100.1
K. The less intelligent child needs more help from parents than the very intelligent one.								
Agree	335	28.2	296	25.0	555	46.8	1186	100.0
Disagree	56	22.2	78	30.8	119	47.1	253	100.1
Total	391	27.2	374	26.0	674	46.8	1439	100.0

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 62C

Frequencies and percentages of responses to the question about the nature of tested intelligence, by social values

Orientation Items:	Inborn		Equally Inborn/Learned		Learned		Total*	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Aristocratic								
C. People of wealth and position should marry their own kind.								
Agree	105	25.8	110	27.0	192	47.2	407	100.0
Disagree	262	26.7	252	25.7	466	47.6	980	100.0
Total	367	26.5	362	26.1	658	47.4	1387	100.0
G. Parents should be allowed to pass on their wealth and prestige to their children regardless of the children's abilities.								
Agree	297	28.0	267	25.2	494	46.7	1058	99.9
Disagree	86	25.3	94	27.6	160	47.1	340	100.0
Total	383	27.4	361	25.8	654	46.8	1398	100.0

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 63A

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for educational decisions, by social values

Orientation Items:	Decisions								
	College Entrance			Special Classes			Who Is To Receive Most Education		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Intellectual Elitism									
A. No amount of education or special training can make up for a lack of natural ability.									
Agree	429	56.4	760	563	74.1	760	308	40.6	758
Disagree	373	55.8	669	517	77.2	670	232	34.6	670
Total	802	56.1	1429	1080	75.5	1430	540	37.8	1428
B. Children who are intelligent should get better schooling, and not have to stick with the average child.									
Agree	614	60.4	1017	829	81.5	1017	437	43.0	1016
Disagree	198	46.7	424	265	62.4	425	108	25.5	423
Total	812	56.3	1441	1094	75.9	1442	545	37.9	1439
E. Something should be done to keep the feeble minded from having children.									
Agree	558	58.2	959	737	76.9	959	385	40.2	957
Disagree	205	54.7	375	276	73.6	375	118	31.6	374
Total	763	57.2	1334	1013	75.9	1334	503	37.8	1331
J. It is only fair that the people with the most intelligence should have the most opportunities.									
Agree	249	65.2	382	301	78.6	383	197	51.4	383
Disagree	556	52.5	1059	780	73.7	1059	343	32.5	1056
Total	805	55.9	1441	1081	75.0	1442	540	37.5	1439
L. The great things accomplished by man are really the works of just a few great geniuses.									
Agree	291	63.0	462	350	75.9	461	211	45.9	460
Disagree	500	52.8	947	713	75.2	948	319	33.7	946
Total	791	56.1	1409	1063	75.4	1409	530	37.6	1408

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 63B

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for occupational decisions and decisions about voting and marrying, by social values

	Decisions											
	Job Hiring			Job Promotion			Voting			Marrying		
Orientation Items:	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Intellectual Elitism												
A. No amount of education or special training can make up for a lack of natural ability.												
Agree	439	57.8	760	356	46.9	759	100	13.2	760	66	8.7	760
Disagree	395	58.9	671	310	46.6	665	64	9.6	668	55	8.2	668
Total	834	58.3	1431	666	46.8	1424	164	11.5	1428	121	8.5	1428
B. Children who are intelligent should get better schooling, and not have to stick with the average child.												
Agree	625	61.4	1018	487	48.2	1011	146	14.4	1017	93	9.1	1017
Disagree	219	51.7	424	188	44.3	424	25	5.9	423	29	6.9	423
Total	844	58.5	1442	675	47.0	1435	171	11.9	1440	122	8.5	1440
E. Something should be done to keep the feeble minded from having children.												
Agree	600	62.4	961	478	50.1	954	135	14.1	959	99	10.3	959
Disagree	199	53.2	374	157	42.0	374	28	7.5	375	20	5.3	374
Total	799	59.9	1335	635	47.8	1328	163	12.2	1334	119	8.9	1333
J. It is only fair that the people with the most intelligence should have the most opportunities.												
Agree	242	63.2	383	210	55.1	381	75	19.6	383	53	13.8	383
Disagree	597	56.4	1059	458	43.5	1052	96	9.1	1057	68	6.4	1057
Total	839	58.2	1442	668	46.6	1433	171	11.9	1440	121	8.4	1440
L. The great things accomplished by man are really the works of just a few great geniuses.												
Agree	291	63.1	461	270	58.8	459	81	17.5	462	59	12.8	462
Disagree	534	56.3	948	385	40.8	953	87	9.2	945	64	6.8	945
Total	825	58.6	1409	655	46.4	1412	168	11.9	1407	123	8.7	1407

*Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 64A

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for educational decisions, by social values

Orientation Items:	Decisions								
	College Entrance			Special Classes			Who Is To Receive Most Education		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Equalitarian									
D. Everyone should have a chance to go to college if he wants to.									
Agree	732	54.6	1340	997	74.4	1340	496	37.1	1337
Disagree	83	66.4	125	103	81.7	126	51	40.5	126
Total	815	55.6	1465	1100	75.0	1466	547	37.4	1463
F. There is no difference in intelligence between racial, religious, or nationality groups.									
Agree	590	56.7	1041	776	74.5	1041	399	38.4	1039
Disagree	214	54.3	394	306	77.7	394	141	35.8	394
Total	804	56.0	1435	1082	75.4	1435	540	37.7	1433
H. A child who is less intelligent rates the same treatment from his teachers as a child who is very bright.									
Agree	675	54.7	1235	925	74.8	1236	464	37.6	1235
Disagree	141	61.0	231	174	75.3	231	84	36.7	229
Total	816	55.7	1466	1099	74.9	1467	548	37.4	1464
I. If all of us were given an equal chance, we would all be equally intelligent.									
Agree	178	60.1	296	217	73.6	295	132	44.9	294
Disagree	628	54.8	1145	866	75.5	1147	408	35.6	1145
Total	806	55.9	1441	1083	75.1	1442	540	37.5	1439
K. The less intelligent child needs more help from parents than the very intelligent one.									
Agree	680	56.6	1201	900	74.9	1202	466	38.9	1199
Disagree	132	51.4	257	193	75.1	257	78	30.4	257
Total	812	55.7	1458	1093	74.9	1459	544	37.4	1456

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 64B

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for occupational decisions and decisions about voting and marrying, by social values

	Decisions											
	Job Hiring			Job Promotion			Voting			Marrying		
Orientation Items:	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Equalitarian:												
D. Everyone should have a chance to go to college if he wants to.												
Agree	780	58.2	1341	630	47.3	1333	152	11.4	1339	108	8.1	1338
Disagree	72	57.6	125	49	38.9	126	21	16.8	125	15	11.9	126
Total	852	58.1	1466	679	46.5	1459	173	11.8	1464	123	8.4	1464
F. There is no difference in intelligence between racial, religious, or nationality groups.												
Agree	589	56.6	1041	488	47.1	1036	110	10.6	1039	85	8.2	1040
Disagree	251	63.7	394	183	46.7	392	62	15.7	394	37	9.4	393
Total	840	58.5	1435	671	47.0	1428	172	12.0	1433	122	8.5	1433
H. A child who is less intelligent rates the same treatment from his teachers as a child who is very bright.												
Agree	725	59.5	1236	572	46.5	1230	150	11.3	1234	100	8.1	1234
Disagree	127	55.0	231	106	46.1	230	30	13.0	231	24	10.4	231
Total	852	58.1	1467	678	46.4	1460	180	12.3	1465	124	8.5	1465
I. If all of us were given an equal chance, we would all be equally intelligent.												
Agree	167	56.7	295	170	58.0	293	57	19.3	296	43	14.5	296
Disagree	676	58.9	1147	501	43.8	1144	114	9.9	1146	78	6.8	1146
Total	843	58.5	1442	671	46.7	1437	171	11.9	1442	121	8.4	1442
K. The less intelligent child needs more help from parents than the very intelligent one.												
Agree	710	59.1	1202	578	48.2	1198	153	12.7	1202	100	8.3	1203
Disagree	139	54.1	257	97	38.2	254	17	6.7	255	21	8.3	254
Total	849	58.2	1459	675	46.5	1452	170	11.7	1457	121	8.3	1457

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 65A

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for educational decisions, by social values

Orientation Items:	Decisions								
	College Entrance			Special Classes			Who Is To Receive Most Education		
	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Aristocratic									
C. People of wealth and position should marry their own kind.									
Agree	247	60.5	408	320	78.2	409	182	44.6	408
Disagree	538	54.1	994	730	73.4	994	342	34.4	993
Total	785	56.0	1402	1050	74.8	1403	524	37.4	1401
G. Parents should be allowed to pass on their wealth and prestige to their children, regardless of the children's abilities.									
Agree	602	56.3	1070	803	75.0	1070	404	37.9	1067
Disagree	191	55.7	340	259	75.3	344	125	36.3	344
Total	793	56.2	1410	1062	75.1	1414	529	37.5	1411

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 65B

Frequencies and percentages of respondents who think it is fair to use intelligence tests for occupational decisions and decisions about voting and marrying, by social values

	Decisions											
	Job Hiring			Job Promotion			Voting			Marrying		
Orientation Items:	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*	f	%	Total*
Aristrocratic												
C. People of wealth and position should marry their own kind.												
Agree	251	61.4	409	219	53.8	407	68	16.6	409	65	15.9	409
Disagree	574	57.7	995	441	44.5	990	98	9.9	992	53	5.3	992
Total	825	58.8	1404	660	47.2	1397	166	11.8	1401	118	8.4	1401
G. Parents should be allowed to pass on their wealth and prestige to their children, regardless of the children's abilities.												
Agree	619	57.8	1070	503	47.1	1067	117	10.9	1070	85	7.9	1070
Disagree	209	60.8	344	153	44.7	342	51	14.8	344	34	9.9	344
Total	828	58.6	1414	656	46.6	1409	168	11.9	1414	119	8.4	1414

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

TABLE 66

Frequencies and percentages of respondents reporting experience with standardized tests, by rural-urban residence and by religion

URBAN

Religion**	None		One or Two		Three or More		Total*	
	Number of test situations							
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Protestant	248	39.3	231	36.6	152	24.1	631	100.0
Catholic	105	38.5	102	37.5	65	23.9	272	99.9
Total	353	39.1	333	36.9	217	24.0	903	100.0

RURAL

Religion**	None		One or Two		Three or More		Total*	
	Number of test situations							
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Protestant	210	48.4	152	35.0	72	16.6	434	100.0
Catholic	27	34.2	37	46.8	15	19.0	79	100.0
Total	237	46.2	189	36.8	87	17.0	513	100.0

* Respondents for whom relevant information is lacking have been eliminated from the total.

** Data on Jewish respondents are not reported in this table since only one Jewish respondent in the sample came from a rural area.

APPENDIX C

FINDINGS RELATING TO RELIGIOUS DIFFERENCES

APPENDIX C

FINDINGS RELATING TO RELIGIOUS DIFFERENCES

The distribution of religious preferences among the sample was as follows: 72% Protestant (1,065), 24% Catholic (352), and 2% Jewish (31). Because of the small number of Jewish respondents, all findings reported here should be considered tentative. However, they may point to a number of areas in which further investigation may prove fruitful.

We begin with the question of test-taking experience. Table 26 shows that Jews tend to report more experience than either of the other religious groups ($p < .10$). One could argue that these differences are confounded by the fact that thirty of the 31 Jewish respondents were from large metropolitan areas. However, while there was more test experience among urban dwellers regardless of religious affiliation, the greater experience among Jewish respondents is evident even when compared to the urban non-Jewish respondents (Table 66). Moreover, these findings seem to accord with what we know about the greater interest in academic pursuits on the part of Jews.*

The greater tendency of Jewish respondents to report test-taking experience occurred in each of the contexts of test administration. The only exception was (Tables 28A, 28B, 28C) in the "job application" situation, where slightly more Catholics reported having taken tests than did the other religious groups.

The religious affiliation of the respondent had a slight, but non-significant effect on his off-spring's test-taking experience (Table 30).

---

*Strodtbeck, Fred L. "Jewish and Italian Immigration and Subsequent Status Mobility." In McClelland, David C., Baldwin, Alfred L., Bronfenbrenner, Urie, & Strodtbeck, Fred L. Talent and Society, Appendix. New York: Van Nostrand, 1958.

Jews (67%) were more likely to report that their children had taken tests than Protestants (54%) or Catholics (55%).

Jews (94%) were more likely to compare themselves favorably with others than were Catholics (83%) or Protestants (72%). Jews were also somewhat less likely to make unfavorable comparisons with others than either of the other two religious groups (Table 39).

Regarding the nature of tested intelligence (Table 45), more Jews (45%) than Protestants (27%) or Catholics (28%) said that tests measure inborn intelligence, and fewer said that it measures what is learned.

More Catholics and Jews than Protestants saw the use of tests as fair for "college entrance" decisions (Tables 51A, 51B). More Protestants than Catholics and Jews considered the use of tests as fair for "job hiring" and "job promotion."*

---

* It will be recalled from Chapter V that race differences in attitudes toward the fairness of using tests were not statistically significant. However, there were some trends as follows: Whites tended to be somewhat more in favor of tests for "college entrance" decisions while Negroes were more likely to approve of the use of tests for "job hiring" and "job promotion" (Tables 51A, 51B). Since most Negroes tend to be Protestant (79% of the 187 Negroes in our sample), one could argue that the trends might be due to religious differences. A check on this possibility revealed that, at least in the case of "job hiring," there was indeed no significant difference between white and Negro Protestant respondents. It appears that white Catholic respondents account for the difference, since they were generally less favorably inclined toward the use of tests. The items referring to the use of tests for "college entrance" decisions and "job promotion" showed no significant religious differences. Our data, then, support the explanation that racial differences in attitudes toward using tests for "job hiring" are accounted for by religious differences. This does not seem to be the case, however, for "job promotion" and "college entrance" decisions.